BIBLIOTHECA
FF. PRÆDICATORUM
CONVENTUS
CIVIT. BENITIÆ
Lit. .....
Pl. .....

ST. MICHAEL'S WOOD
CATHOLIC
BOOKS OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

THE

VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

VOL. I.

Ecclesiæ autem unitas in duobus attenditur: scilicet in connexione membrorum Ecclesiæ ad invicem, seu communicatione; et iterum in ordine omnium membrorum Ecclesiæ ad unum caput, secundum illud ad Coloss. ii. 18, 19: *Inflatus sensu carnis suæ, et non tenens Caput, ex quo totum corpus, per nexus et conjunctiones subministratum et constructum, crescit in augmentum Dei.* Hoc autem caput est ipse Christus, cujus vicem in Ecclesia gerit Summus Pontifex. Et ideò schismatici dicuntur qui subesse renuunt Summo Pontifici, et qui membris Ecclesiæ ei subjectis communicare recusant.

S. Thom. Aquin. *Summ. Theol.* 2da 2dæ. *Quæst.* xxxix. *Art.* i. n. 3.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE

VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

MAINTAINED AGAINST OPPOSITE THEORIES:

WITH AN

EXPLANATION OF CERTAIN PASSAGES IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

ERRONEOUSLY APPEALED TO IN THEIR SUPPORT.

BY

M. J. RHODES, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1870.

All rights reserved.

NIHIL OBSTAT.

Gulielmus A. Johnson.

IMPRIMATUR.

✠ HENRICUS EDUARDUS,

Archiepiscopus Westmon.

DEDICATORY LETTER, &c.

To the Right Reverend WM. DELANY, D.D.,
Lord Bishop of Cork.

My Dear Lord,

In addition to the daily spiritual benefits conferred upon your own numerous flock by your Lordship's unwearied pastoral exertions, many a stranger's heart is cheered and gladdened by the hospitable welcome which your truly Christian kindness so largely extends to all.

Englishmen especially may thereby be reminded of the generous and cordial greeting with which Ireland in ancient days received her many visitants from the Anglo-Saxon and the British nations, who thronged as students to her far-famed halls of learning, or sought the way to heaven, as disciples of Christ, in her equally celebrated schools of piety and high religion.

The motives which led to my long sojourn in your Lordship's diocese were more ordinary in their nature, and did not entitle me to any such reception. Yet during the seven or eight years through which it has been my privilege to love and venerate you as my Bishop, the repeated marks of favour which your unceasing goodness

has heaped upon me, and which will ever be remembered by me with sincerest gratitude, would furnish proof, if such were needed, that the hearts of Irish Churchmen are still animated by the princely spirit of the olden time.

Now that I am returning to my native shores, your Lordship has crowned these many acts of kindness by graciously permitting me to connect your name with the present volumes.

The work was begun with your Lordship's blessing; it has progressed under your encouragement; and on its completion I thankfully avail myself of your most kind consent to allow me to dedicate it to you, as a small but earnest token of my grateful affection and my unfeigned respect.

Once more begging your episcopal benediction on the produce of my labours and on myself,

I have the honour to remain,

My dear Lord,

Your Lordship's most faithful and obliged servant,

M. J. RHODES.

GLENGARIFF, BANTRY, CO. CORK:
Feast of St. Edward the Confessor,
Oct. 13*th*, 1869.

To M. J. RHODES, Esq.

My dear Mr. Rhodes,

A treatise of such graceful and scholarlike execution, on a subject so important as that which is dealt with in your work, ought to have been ushered into the world under the auspices of some more distinguished name than the obscure one you have selected. Such you might readily have found, but the extremely kind manner in which you expressed your desire to inscribe my own at the head of your book, precluded me from pressing this upon you.

In the spirit of that generous friendship which I have had the happiness of enjoying for several years, you discarded prudential considerations, and I acquiesced, under the conviction that a production of such rare and intrinsic merits must ensure its own success without any considerable delay.

A more appropriate votive tribute could not have been devised on your part, in gratitude to the blessed Spirit of light and love Who in days gone by conducted you into the communion of the Church, opening your heart to her voice and teachings, which are as ancient as Christianity and as unchanging as its truth. Your familiarity with the difficulties and misapprehensions that affect the minds of English churchmen, and the clearness with which you explain the Church's doctrine, will render your work of invaluable service in their regard; and I cannot refrain from expressing my unfeigned delight at the charitable spirit you have displayed, in your mode of treating the points of controversy which unhappily keep them apart from us.

On the other hand, Catholics, especially of these isles, must derive peculiar pleasure and no small addition to their information, from the perusal of your learned production. The Celtic tribes of these regions are only beginning to be introduced to the general acquaintance of the scholars of our day, and the pursuit of your subject has led you to the consideration of events in their history, which are of peculiar interest to ourselves, and but little known or understood. I cannot conceive how anyone can rise from the perusal of your interesting and masterly examination into the evidence which still survives upon the subject, without a thorough conviction that, notwithstanding their divergence in certain points of discipline, the ancient Christian inhabitants of these countries were bound in an indissoluble bond of union with the Mother and Mistress of Churches.

Praying a blessing on yourself and all that are dear to you, and on this work, the fruit of pious zeal,

I am,

My dear Mr. Rhodes,

Yours very sincerely,

✠ WILLIAM DELANY.

Cork: *October* 22, 1869.

PREFACE.

THIS work was originally commenced as a letter to a valued friend of early years, who took a leading part in the general meeting of the 'English Church Union,' held in July 1866; by which meeting a formal resolution was adopted, welcoming the publication of Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon,' and expressing the earnest desire of the Association for the restoration of unity to Christendom.

The proportions which the writing assumed as it progressed were larger than had been contemplated at its commencement; and when half of it was completed, my friend himself having become convinced of the divine authority of the Roman Catholic Church, sought and received admission into her communion.

A great part of the book was consequently, to some extent, recast, though not substantially altered. If there still appear in it any traces of the epistolary style, it is owing to the above-mentioned circumstance.

There may be critics, otherwise favourable, who at first sight will object to the fact of a layman having ventured to treat publicly of the matters of theology discussed in this work, particularly in the first and second sections. This difficulty presented itself to my own mind, but it was removed by the approbation with which my proposed design was received, when I submitted it to high ecclesiastical authority; and particularly by the blessing which was accorded to it from its very commencement, and the kind encouragement which throughout accompanied its prosecution, on the part of the Bishop of the diocese in which I was residing at the time. The same Right Reverend Prelate has graciously permitted me to place my volumes, now completed, under his patronage, as may be seen from the foregoing letters.

Moreover, since its completion, the whole of the work has undergone the careful examination of an ecclesiastical censor, appointed for the purpose by the Archbishop in whose diocese it is now about to be published, and whose *Imprimatur* is affixed to it. The first two sections, which form the portion of the book most directly theological, have been in type for more than two years, with the exception of changes not affecting the substance of the matter. They have been carefully perused and examined by more than one distinguished theologian

of our own isles; and, in the summer of 1867, on the occasion of the centenary of St. Peter and St. Paul, I took the opportunity of personally submitting them to the judgment of two professors of theology, belonging respectively to two of the highest ecclesiastical colleges in Rome. One of these was the Reverend Father Cardella, then of the Roman College, now Rector of the Civiltà Cattolica; and he has kindly permitted me to make this use of his name.

I am desirous to call particular attention to these authorities in reference to the explanation of the Church's doctrine on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which is contained in the second section of this work. It is a point on which Dr. Pusey has more than once asked for information, and the statements which I have made respecting it have undergone the strictest scrutiny.

In order to examine and to test the truth of the theory against which these volumes are principally directed, it was necessary, in the first place, to state it with fairness and precision. This alone was the motive which induced me to adopt as my text upon the subject the extracts which I have given from the pages of Dr. Forbes. The statement which they contain of the theory in question

appears to me more clear, concise, and definite, and, I may add, at the same time more plausible, than any which I have met with elsewhere.

In addition to the extracts from Dr. Forbes, Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon' necessarily occupies a prominent position in my pages. But it has by no means been my intention to confine my observations solely to these authors. I have referred to them simply as fair and competent exponents of the theory of invisible unity.

No doubt there may be details respecting which others who maintain the same theory will be found to vary in opinion from the authors above referred to; and there may be Anglicans who would not consent to extend its application so widely as, in some respects, appears to be done by Dr. Forbes. But the theory in itself forms a largely accepted basis for common action, and a widely received rule for individual guidance; and it is to the theory itself, rather than to questions arising out of it, that I have directed my attention in these volumes. Thus, though a recent publication by Mr. Cobb,[1] was issued too late for any special notice in my pages—excepting the few remarks which will be found in a foot-note at page 329, vol. ii.—yet the

[1] 'Separation' not 'Schism.' A plea for the position of Anglican Reunionists. By Gerard Francis Cobb, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Palmer, 1869.

whole of the present work is expressly devoted to the examination of the principle upon which his opinions are based. The same remark will apply to the opinions of all writers, whether of earlier or more recent date, who adopt the same theory of the present suspension of the Church's outward unity.

It was not until after the completion of the account of the British Church, which is comprised in my second volume, that I became aware of the collection of documents lately edited by Mr. Haddan.[1] I should otherwise have derived from them considerable assistance. Although the learned editor does not hesitate to speak of the 'Schism between the British and the Roman Churches,' and to designate it as 'formal,' (p. 152), yet the facts which he has produced in his work corroborate my own statements. The very few passages amongst his quotations which may at first sight assume a different aspect, are not of sufficient weight to withstand the existing amount of counter testimony. They will bear, and they require, the same interpretation, which, as I have shown, must

[1] Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Edited after Spelman and Wilkins. By Arthur West Haddan, B.D., and William Stubbs, M.A. Vol. I. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1869.

be applied to certain strong expressions occasionally met with in the pages of St. Bede.

It has been my anxious desire, throughout the whole of this work, to avoid any term or mode of expression which might give offence. But since terms involve principles, and principles do not admit of compromise, I have at times felt some difficulty in the selection of my language. It appeared to me, however, that the simplest course was to adopt the expressions now most in use, intending them in their commonly received sense.

I have endeavoured to render the book as generally interesting and as little controversial as possible; and I have not hesitated to speak more fully than was absolutely necessary for the sake of argument, on such incidental points as appeared particularly to invite notice.

M. J. RHODES.

18 Green Street, Grosvenor Square,
London, W.

Christmas Day, 1869.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

INTRODUCTORY.

PAGE

Statement of the subject of the work 1
Division of the subject 4

SECTION I.

The one true Church of Christ.

The Divine nature and origin of the Unity of Christ's Church 7
The Unity of the Church is permanently visible . . 8
Permanent and visible Unity is pledged to her by Christ . 9
There can be no union with Christ excepting through the Church 15
Invincible ignorance 17
Individual responsibility 18
No corporate body of Christians can belong to the Church who are not visibly in her communion . . . 20
There is only one Church 21
The one true Church is visible to all men 22
Christ's commission to His Church 25
It is acted upon by the Roman Catholic Church alone. . 26
The four Notes of the Church 28
The Church's Unity 28
Rome and England not one Church 29
Differences amongst Roman Catholics 30
Inconsistent charges against them 32
Universality of the Church's Unity 34
The Church's Sanctity 35
The Church's Catholicity 38

PAGE
Rome is the centre of her Catholicity 39
Title of Catholic 40
The Church's Apostolicity 41
Mission and jurisdiction 42
The Roman Primacy 43
Necessity of rightful jurisdiction 43
Necessity of Apostolic doctrine 44
St. Peter's chair and office 45
Distinction between the Episcopate, Apostolate, and Primacy 45
Christ founded the Church on St. Peter and his successors, associating St. Peter with Himself 48
Christ rules the Church through St. Peter and his successors 50
St. Peter's See is the strength of the Episcopate 53
It is Christ Who acts in all 55
St. Peter's office continues in his successors 56
The Primacy is a great grace 58
Visible and present testimony to the Apostolicity of Rome . 60
Rome is the centre of the Church's Unity 63
The Church bears the image of her Lord 64

SECTION II.

Examination of the theory of the existence of invisible unity between outwardly divided bodies of Christians.

The Church's notes are inseparable, and each one of them is indispensable 64
None of them can become invisible 65
The theory of the suspension of visible unity tested . . 66
Statement of the above-mentioned theory, as contained in a work entitled 'A short explanation of the Nicene Creed' by Dr. Forbes, the Anglican Bishop of Brechin . . 69
The Church is only one, though comprising hierarchies in many nations 75
Exclusiveness of the one Church 76
God's universal mercies 77
The Catholic doctrine on grace outside the Church, as stated by Dr. Newman 78
Cases of goodness in individuals 81
Personal responsibility 83

PAGE
Goodness amongst the unbaptized 83
The lustre of the Church's Saints 85
Greek Missions 85
Fecundity of the Ancient Heresies 86
Nestorians 86
Jacobites 88
Arianism, and the Arian Goths 90
Bishop Ulphilas 91
Other heresies 92
State of the early ages 92
Dr. Newman's account of the fourth century . . . 93
Dr. Newman's account of the fifth and sixth centuries . 96
Present trials of the Church 98
The Church's golden age 99
Ancient appellation of 'Roman' 100
The tenth century of the Church 101
Rome and the Popes of that age 101
The Church's holiness is always visible 104
It was so in the tenth century—Instances 105
St. Romuald and Camaldoli 109
The Hospice of St. Bernard and its founder . . . 109
Other instances 111
Cluny and its Abbots 113
Saints unknown to us 114
St. Peter Damian 116
Christ's presence in His Church is never lessened . . 116
Her visible unity never is suspended 119
Distinction between individual Christians and the Church 121
All the children of the Church are taught by God . . 122
All are not obedient 124
The Church exists for the salvation of mankind . . 124
God's promises to His Church are absolute and unconditional 126
Distinction between ordinary and extraordinary gifts . 128
Christ's presence never varies as regards all that is needful for His Church 129
The peculiar force of the words of His promise to be always 'with her' 131
The prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Church of Christ 134

PAGE
The prophecies of Isaias 135
The prophecies of Holy David 137
The Church is not exempted from affliction . . . 139
The Church as described in the Book of Canticles . . 140
Prophecies of Ezechiel 141
Prophecies of Jeremias 143
The theory tested by the Gospel 147
It is shown to be inconsistent with the doctrine of the Gospel 148
Also with the Gospel precepts 150
Differences between Rome and England respecting points of faith 155
Difference respecting the ground of faith 156
Are they agreed respecting the articles of the faith? . . 158
The Roman profession of faith 159
Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the Vicar of Jesus Christ 161
Difference respecting the Sacraments 161
Baptism 161
Confirmation 162
The Holy Eucharist 163
Penance 163
Extreme Unction 164
Teaching of the Council of Trent on Extreme Unction . 164
Its object 168
Its matter 171
Its form 172
Postponement of the last Sacraments 176
Popular errors as to the time of receiving Extreme Unction 177
The Church's doctrine respecting its repetition . . . 179
Explanation respecting its remission of sins . . . 181
Explanation of the term 'remains of sin.' . . . 184
The effects of Extreme Unction, as explained in the Roman Catechism 187
The teaching of St. Charles Borromeo respecting it . . 189
The teaching of Suarez on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction 191
It is a sacrament of special mercy 193
Difference in faith respecting it 195
Rome's maternal care for the dying 197
The Sacrament of Holy Orders 198

PAGE
The Sacrament of Matrimony 198
Indulgences, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints . . . 199
The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary . 200
The difference between Rome and England on the above-mentioned points, proves that they are not one in the faith 203
Which of the two is right? 205
Sacraments, but not salvation, may be found outside the Catholic Church 206
As Christ acts through His ministers in baptizing, and absolving, and the rest, so through the successors of St. Peter He constantly rules His Church . . . 208
Definition of the Unity of the Church by St. Thomas Aquinas 209
The Church requires a visible head to remove occasion of schism 210

SECTION III.

Explanation of certain passages in ecclesiastical history, appealed to in support of the theory of invisible unity.

Anglican appeal to past ecclesiastical dissensions . . 211
The want of analogy between the instances produced, and the present divisions of Christendom 212
The dissensions at Corinth 213
Rome appealed to, though St. John the Evangelist was still alive 213

St. Victor and the Asiatic Churches.

The grounds of the difference 215
The Synods held upon the subject 216
Letter from Polycrates and the other Asiatic bishops, to the Pope St. Victor and the Roman Church . . . 218
The conduct of St. Victor 219
His authority not disputed 220
The result 221
Ancient testimony that there was no breach of unity . 223
Decision of the Nicene Council as to the time of Easter . 223

The Cyprianic contest.

Reasons for doubting whether there was any formal or complete breach of unity between St. Cyprian and the Pope St. Stephen 225

PAGE
Testimony of St. Augustine 226
If intercommunion was suspended, it could have been only for a passing moment 228
The special honour shown to St. Cyprian by Rome . . 229
The letter of Firmilian 229
It testifies to the then existing claims of the Roman See . 230
Its excited language 231
The respect due to Firmilian 234
Evidence of the office of the Roman See 235
St. Vincent of Lerins extols the conduct of St. Stephen . 237
The Councils of Arles and of Nice on the controverted point 239
Question of the authenticity of the letters of St. Cyprian and Firmilian 240
St. Cyprian's actual sentiments respecting the primacy of the Roman See 240

The case of St. Meletius and the divisions in Antioch.

The statements of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes . . . 243
Observations on the ecclesiastical position of Meletius . 244
Position of both the Catholic parties in Antioch . . 246
Contrast between their position and that of the Church of England 247
Both these parties in Antioch agreed as to the faith . . 248
The sermon of St. Gregory Nazianzen 249
The origin of the schism in Antioch 251
The election of Meletius to the bishopric of Antioch . 252
His early life and connection with the Arians . . . 253
His election to the see of Antioch was the work of the Arian faction 255
Certain Catholics concurred in his election . . . 256
Theodoret's account of the transaction 257
The more consistent Catholics of Antioch, viz., the 'Eustathians,' would not recognise his election . . . 259
Laxity of the other Catholics of Antioch in mixing with the Arian congregations 259
Paulinus was the leader of the Eustathians in Antioch . 260
St. Athanasius supported the said Eustathians . . . 261
Respective motives of the Catholics who joined in the election of Meletius, and of the Arians, in choosing him for the see of Antioch 262

PAGE

The glowing contemporary descriptions of 'the Great Meletius' 263
The entrance of Meletius into Antioch 265
His public profession of the Nicene Faith 267
His consequent banishment 268
The accusations against him 269
The observations of St. Epiphanius on his sermon, and on the steadfastness of his flock in the true faith . . 269
The rumours against St. Meletius 270
They were disregarded by St. Epiphanius. 271
The favourable change effected in Antioch by St. Meletius 272
The Eustathians still held aloof from him, though of one mind in the faith 273
St. Meletius and other Catholic bishops recalled from exile 274
Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari, who were recalled amongst the number, appear to have possessed legatine authority from the Pope, for the Council of Alexandria and the affairs of the East 275
Historical testimony to the same 279
Lucifer goes to Antioch and Eusebius to Alexandria, where, together with St. Athanasius, he convenes a Council . 281
The Council of Alexandria and its indulgence to the fallen 282
The said indulgence would apply to Meletius, and was considered to do so according to the tradition of the Roman Church 284
The epistle of the Council of Alexandria respecting the affairs of Antioch 285
Remarks upon the aforesaid epistle 291
The consecration of Paulinus by Lucifer 292
The consequent displeasure of St. Eusebius of Vercelli, when he afterwards arrived in Antioch 294
The question of Lucifer's sanctity . . . Note to p. 295
The position of Paulinus 296
The position of Meletius 298
Eusebius proceeds on his mission through the East, and then gladdens Italy by his return 300
The three exiles of St. Meletius 301
He holds a Council in Antioch 302
Its profession of faith gave rise to rumours against his orthodoxy, and against that of St. Eusebius of Samosata 303

PAGE
Yet it fulfilled the requirements of the Council of Alexandria 305
These two bishops accused of Arianism before Pope St. Damasus, and warmly defended by St. Basil . . 305
Interchange of communication between St. Meletius and Rome 306
Evagrius of Antioch, on his return from the West, leads St. Basil to expect that he will join the party of Meletius, but afterwards unites himself to Paulinus—Argument deduced from this 307
Neither side was separated from the universal Church . 308
Paulinus defends himself by a profession of his faith . 308
Later accusations against Paulinus 308
St. Athanasius and St. Meletius 309
Different degrees of excommunication, or of interruption of ecclesiastical communion 310
St. Basil maintains the cause of St. Meletius in a letter to St. Epiphanius 312
Yet St. Basil remained in full communion with the West . 313
The object which St. Basil had in view 314
Paulinus and his party elated by letters from the West . 315
St. Basil's letter to Count Terence on the subject . . 315
He writes also to St. Meletius upon it 318
The letters to Paulinus which may be supposed to be those alluded to, and their motive 318
The elation which they caused indicates the uncertainty of the position of Paulinus 320
Vitalis of Antioch 322
The letters of St. Jerome to the Pope, St. Damasus, requesting direction in his perplexities 323
Their recognition of the necessity of communion with Rome, of the Pope's authority, and of his office as guardian of the faith 324
The miserable death of the Arian Emperor Valens . . 327
St. Meletius returns from his third exile 328
His reception by the people, as described by St. John Chrysostom 328
The alleged compact between Meletius and Paulinus . 329
Doubts whether it was really entered into 330
Both St. Meletius and Paulinus openly acknowledged by the West 332

PAGE

Proof of the visible communion of St. Meletius with the Roman See, before the second General Council was assembled 333

Further history of the internal schism in Antioch, after the death of St. Meletius 336

Termination of the schism 337

St. Meletius is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology . 337

The said Martyrology has been more than once carefully revised and corrected 338

Strictness as to the names admitted into it . . . 340

That of St. Meletius is still mentioned there with honour, which is a crowning proof that he died in outward and visible communion with the Roman See . . . 341

THE

VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Quam dilecta tabernacula tua Domine virtutum: concupiscit et deficit anima mea in atria Domini.

Beati, qui habitant in domo tua Domine.

Psal. lxxxiii.

The Church continues always one. Acts iv. 32.

In the earliest days of Christianity, 'the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul.' But this universal unity was of short duration. Schisms and heresies arose whilst Apostles were still upon the earth; divisions began to abound amongst Christians, and have ever since abounded more and more. Nevertheless, the true Church of Christ still holds on her course, distinct from the separated fragments, uncontaminated by the surrounding errors, always visibly one from the beginning, in the strength and the unity of God.

Anglican efforts for re-union.

It is a hopeful sign for our time and country that men most distinguished for their piety, learning, and position in the communion of the established Church of

England, have freely and openly avowed their earnest desires for the re-union of Christendom; and have made direct efforts and proposals, in order to ascertain a basis on which negotiations for a general reconciliation might be opened, not only with the distant East, but also with the more neighbouring Church of Rome, which till recently was regarded even by the learned and the good amongst their body, as an object of mysterious and religious dread; a bearer of subtle and deadly poison; and one whose very fascinations were a cause and reason for mistrust. Many of the same Anglican body now acknowledge that Church, at least as their patriarchal see, and anxiously hope for the day when they may no longer be severed from her communion.

Ps. lxxvi. 11. 'This is the change of the right hand of the Most High!'

Rome's response. Rome yearns over her separated children, and sighs for their return with more than any human mother's love; but no true love will ever betray its trust. Rome knows that heaven has confided to her a high commission for the benefit of the whole human race, and she cannot prove unfaithful to it, or play a double part by consenting to ignore it, for the sake of any end however ardently to be desired in itself. Therefore, so long as this her divine commission is unacknowledged by those who are seeking for re-union, she can make no response to their advances, except by earnest exhortations, and unceasing prayer for them to God.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

The Anglican proposals are based on a principle repudiated by Rome.

Underlying this great difficulty there is another, connected with it, but requiring special consideration. The Anglican proposals for re-union assume, as a first principle, that the present divisions of Christendom, so far at least as regards the three great communions of Rome, the East, and England, though grave, still are not vital, for that the outwardly-divided bodies continue inwardly one in Christ. The maintainers of this opinion do not deny that there is only one Church of Christ, and that outside that Church there is no salvation; but they assert that essential unity may exist without being visible, and not only (as is allowed by Rome), that individuals invincibly ignorant may belong to the soul of the Church though outwardly separated from her visible communion; but also, that the separate and independent religious bodies which have been mentioned, though visibly divided and without any outward intercommunion, nevertheless form together in the sight of God, that one holy Catholic Church which is animated by His one Spirit, and constitutes His one ambassador to fallen man, being in reality, the one Body of His Son. Rome rejects this doctrine, and asserts that the Church of Christ can suffer no division, either visible or invisible, but must continue to the eyes of all men, always and only one, outwardly as well as inwardly; that the visible intercommunion of all the parts and all the members is essential to their life, and also to the integrity of the one body; that without it

they cease to be animated by the one Spirit; and that, apart from visible communion with this one Church, no religious body can be a channel of the grace of Christ; nor any single soul attain salvation, excepting in the case of individuals whose ignorance is invincible in the sight of God.

Object of the present work.

This is the point on which both parties finally join issue. It lies at the root of the whole question, and it is not easy to perceive how any further advance can be made towards reconciliation until this difficulty is removed. Therefore, all those who truly desire the re-union of a divided Christendom (and what Christian heart does not yearn to see it?) are interested in the examination of the Anglican theory which maintains that the one Church of Christ is now outwardly split into fragments which have no visible intercommunion, but which, in spite of their external division, are nevertheless internally and invisibly united; all of them being partakers of the one Spirit, though no longer joined together or acting together in one external body.

The object of the present work is to analyse and enquire into this most important subject, and to ascertain whether the said theory is so well founded, that men may trust their immortal souls for all eternity to the conclusions which they derive from it.

Division of the subject.

The subject will be divided into three sections.

In the first I propose, in a cursory and general manner, to assign reasons for belief in the necessity of visible unity in the Church, and in its actual and

permanent continuance, showing where it must be looked for, and may be found, at the present day.

In the second, I propose to examine more particularly into the previously mentioned theory of the existence of invisible unity under outward division, as set forth by Dr. Pusey, in the 'Eirenicon,' and by Dr. Forbes, the Anglican Bishop of Brechin, in his 'Explanation of the Nicene Creed,' and as generally maintained by the more advanced members of the same communion.

The third section, which will form the largest portion of the work, will be devoted to the consideration of a few of the most prominent instances brought forward by the above-mentioned writers from ecclesiastical history in support of the theory in question; treating particularly of the differences between St. Victor and the Asiatics; of those between St. Stephen on the one side, and St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian on the other; of the divisions at Antioch, in which the great St. Meletius was so intimately concerned; and lastly, of the divergence of the Celtic churches in Britain, on certain points of discipline, from the Roman and general ecclesiastical usages.

The spirit of the work.

Throughout the whole discussion I shall not shrink from the examination of any apparently adverse fact, and never will I conceal or compromise any truth.

My object is not controversy, but concord. If at times I express myself strongly, I will never write bitterly. If I shrink not from exposing error, it shall not be in a spirit of provocation. If I must

say what is unpalatable, I ask for indulgence if it be true. I have no new theories to unfold, no schemes of human prudence to propound, for such have not the promise—'Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye on the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, which is the good way, and walk ye in it: and you shall find refreshment for your souls.'

Jerem. vi. 16.

Advantage of friendly discussion.

Until recently there has existed amongst the more advanced members of the Church of England, a manifest shrinking from the free and open discussion of these important subjects. The ice has, at last, to some extent been broken, and it is evident that if men really desire re-union, they will give both a patient hearing and a patient answer to the 'other side;' if they truly love truth and peace, they will not be deterred from the pursuit of them by any whispers of prejudice, or by any subtle suggestions (whether from without or from within their own breasts), to close eyes and ears, and to stifle every spirit of investigation. Controversy too often engenders strife, and tends to make hearts harder; but friendly and free discussion gives rise to explanation, and thus conduces to a better understanding. Let it be hoped that the thawing waters will not be suffered again to freeze. Above all, may God protect us from frozen hearts! Better the passing anger of a loving zeal, than the chill stagnation of a fixed estrangement.

I.

Una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matris suæ.
Cant. Cantic. vi. 8.

The Church's Unity is from God.

St. John xvii.

THE Unity of Christ's Church is divine in its nature and in its origin, as the Holy Gospels testify:—'These things Jesus spake, and lifting up his eyes to heaven, He said, Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee. . . . . I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me: because they are Thine; and all My things are Thine, and Thine are Mine: and I am glorified in them. And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy Name, whom Thou hast given Me: *that they may be one, as We also are. . . . . And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me. That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*'

No union which is merely human could satisfy this prayer. No confederacy of independent churches could fulfil the prophecy which it conveys. It asks for and by asking it foretells a living unity of heart and soul and creed, amongst men of every nation and every clime, so long as the world shall last; a unity never witnessed upon earth, excepting in the Church of Christ. This unity is the supernatural mark and

Ps. lxvii. 7. proof of the abiding presence of that 'God Who maketh men of one manner to dwell in a house.' As such it was prayed for by our Blessed Lord. He asked His Father for it as a mark of His Divine mission. To be a mark at all it must be visible. To extend as such to all future believers it must not only be visible, it must be permanent; and it must belong exclusively to those who believe in Him aright. It must be a visible and a never-failing mark and note of His one true Church. Not hidden in its members' hearts, but manifested in their lives and outward communion. It must be an outward as well as an inward Unity, or it would not be visible. It must be inward as well as outward, or it would not be real. The unity of God is both its model and its source. Our Lord Himself has said it. It is a foretaste

St. John xvii. of glory:—'And the glory which Thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as We also are One. I in them, and Thou in Me: that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast also loved Me. . . . . And I have made known Thy Name to them, and will make it known: that the love, wherewith Thou hast loved Me, may be in them, and I in them.'

Unity exists. Has this Divine prayer failed? Have the ages lessened its efficacy? Has this mark of the Church been effaced?

If these things cannot be, then visible Unity must

now exist, an actual and divine reality, which, in the fulness of its life is within the reach of all.

'God is not as a man, that He should lie, nor as the son of man, that He should be changed. Hath He said then, and will He not do? hath He spoken, and will He not fulfil?' Numbers xxiii. 19.

Where is our faith if we can imagine that the prayer of Jesus, thus close upon His agony, fell unheeded and was lost? Of Him, who pledged to us His word, that His Father will give us all that we ask for in His Name?

Unity unimpaired by sin of man.

Yet it has been said that man's sin has broken the outward bond of unity, marred the designs of the eternal God, and effaced from His spouse this note of her election. Man's sin once brought the deluge. God's promise renders us fearless of its return, even when the world goes after Antichrist. Man's sin is now as impotent to destroy God's bright creation, as man's best efforts would be impotent to create. Come what may, 'all the days of the earth, seed time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, night and day, shall not cease,' for God has said it. Happen what will, the visible unity of the One Church on the One Rock, of the One Light on the One Candlestick, of the One City on God's own Hill, of the One body of the faithful united in the Chair of Peter, shall never fail, upheld by Christ's prayer, and by His promise:—'Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' Gen. viii. 22. St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

God loved the world when He first created it and pronounced it good. God loved the world when it lay before Him, cleansed with the awful baptism of the deluge. But what was this love of His natural creation, compared with that which He bears to the new creation of His grace? What His love for the globe thus washed with water, compared to that with which He loves the mystic spouse of His dear Son, rising pure and spotless from the deluge of His passion, from the washing of His blood? Sooner shall winter and summer, seed time and harvest, fail, and cease to gladden man's heart, than God shall suffer the beacon light of His Church—the one sure guide of man into the haven of eternal life—to become uncertain. Never will He permit the human race He loves so well to be perplexed and misled by an outwardly divided Church, giving scattered tokens and opposing signals, lights manifold and divergent, because posted on hills widely severed in their summits, albeit they may seem to touch each other at the base.

Circumstances of our Lord's prayer for Unity.

All the circumstances of the divine prayer for Unity demand attention. Why should our Lord have offered it up so publicly? Why should He have caused it to be handed down to all generations, in the gospel? No word or act of His was without its meaning, and its teaching, and its power. Had the prayer been made in silence, in the stillness and the darkness of Gethsemani, its power would have been the same; but its meaning and its teaching

would have been withheld from us. Whereas its publicity, and its marked solemnity of form, time, and place, reveal a special purpose. Our Lord desired by that prayer to teach us, as well as to procure us, the visible Unity of His Church.

Public for our sakes.

When the stone was taken away from the tomb of Lazarus, before raising him to life, 'Jesus lifting up His eyes' (the selfsame expression) 'said: Father, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard me.'

St. John xi. 41, 42.

Our Lord explains why He said this;—'And I knew,' He immediately adds, 'that Thou hearest me always, *but because of the people who stand about have I said it;* that they may believe that Thou hast sent me.' The motive (*that they may believe that Thou hast sent me*) was the same as in the prayer for Unity. Had the thanks been offered in secret, had Lazarus been secretly resuscitated, the miracle, though truly wrought, would not have availed as a public sign of our Lord's mission from His Father. Had the prayer for Unity been offered in private, or had that Unity been merely inward (to conceive an impossibility), its testimony to the divinity of our Lord's mission would not have been manifest. If all the divided communions which profess belief in Christ belong to that body of the faithful for whose unity Christ prayed, then the testimony which He asked for cannot have been given.

At another time when, troubled in soul, our blessed Lord exclaimed:—'Father, glorify Thy Name,' a voice responded from heaven:—'I have

St. John xii. 27-30.

both glorified it, and will glorify it again:' and Jesus said:—'This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes.'

So is it for man's sake that His thrice-hallowed prayer for Unity is published and proclaimed with the world-wide gospel, and shall be throughout all time.

Expressly for all time.

The prayer itself is *expressly* for all time; and therefore the Unity which it obtained must be perpetual, and can never be suspended. On various occasions our Lord addressed His disciples in words which are universally understood to apply to all future generations, although not so expressed. But in this mysterious prayer for visible Unity he expressly mentions us, ourselves, and all who are to follow us, so long as time shall last; nay, for all eternity; for charity and Unity shall never fail. He takes most loving pains to mention us. His Unity is to be our own portion, not merely that of His early followers. It was to be everlasting as Himself; not to fail after a few centuries. He prays for those around Him, and then He adds:—

St. John xvii.

'Not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me: that they all may be one, as Thou Father, in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. . . . I in them, and Thou in Me; that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast also loved Me.'

One in God, and as God, one in time and in eternity. Visibly and invisibly, outwardly and inwardly, really, truly, divinely '*made perfect in one!*' Oh heritage of heaven, never will we abandon Thee! Thou never-failing mark and witness of the love of the Father, the mission of the Son, and the abiding presence of the Spirit! 'One in Us!' O stupendous mystery of love! O sweetest words of power! Dearer 'than gold and many precious stones: sweeter than honey and the honey-comb!' The tongue can never tire of speaking them, nor the ear weary of their repetition. The heart loves them, and lingers on them; it ponders over them, and chews them in the cud of mental prayer. Like the peace of God, they surpass all human sense.—*Exsuperant omnem sensum.* Philipp. iv. 7.

The prayer of Jesus could not fail.

I ask again, Has this divine prayer failed and come to nought? Has this earnest blood-confirmed petition of our God, made man, gone up to heaven and come back unanswered or refused? Was His strong cry in vain? Could *Jesus* pray in vain? At the tomb of Lazarus, before He raised the dead, He addressed His Father and He said,—'I knew that Thou hearest Me always.' Was His eucharistic dying prayer to be the one exception?

Again I ask, Has He not pledged His word that what we pray for in His Name shall be granted to us? In His discourse of that same night, which preceded His prayer for Unity, He said to those assembled:—'Amen, amen, I say to you: if you ask the Father anything in My Name, He will give it St. John xvi. 23, 24.

you. Hitherto you have not asked anything in My name. Ask, and you shall receive: that your joy may be full.'

If, then, He declared that His Father always hears Him; if He promised as regards each one of us that all we ask through Him shall be bestowed upon us; it is inconceivable, it would be blasphemy to say, that this one prayer alone has fallen short of its full effects. Our poor prayers indeed may still be wanting in conditions essential to their acceptance; but we know that the prayer of Christ at least, was perfect. If Jesus prays in vain, which of us can hope for mercy?

Romans iii. 4.

'But God is true: and every man a liar, as it is written: *That Thou mayest be justified in Thy words, and mayest overcome when Thou art judged.*'—

St. Mark xiii. 31.

'Heaven and earth,' said our Lord, after His prophecy on the Mount of Olivet, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.'

This divine prayer then, is a pledge to us of the perpetual visible Unity of the Church of Christ; and such Unity is an abiding mark that Christ is with her, and a testimony that He is God.

Unity implies visible intercommunion.

The assertion that, through oneness in Christ the Head, invisible Unity may exist between religious bodies without visible intercommunion, seems to confound the position of such bodies with that of individual Christians in invincible ignorance.

There can be no union with Christ excepting

through the Church. It is by baptism that men become members of Christ, and baptism, by whomsoever administered, is a sacrament of the one Church. It therefore renders each one on whom it is conferred a child of that only Church, and entails upon him all the duties involved in that relation. It is to that one visible Church that he must look for the other sacraments of Christ; it is from her teaching he must learn the faith of Christ; it is to her that his obedience is due, and his sole allegiance. St. Augustine sees a figure of this in the women of old, the wives of Abraham and Jacob, the children of whose handmaids were reckoned as their own, because begotten by their own husbands; as, in baptism, Christ begets children to the Church, even though it be outside her. But the same holy doctor teaches also, and no less distinctly, that such baptism is of no avail for those who incur the guilt of remaining outside her, apart from her visible communion. By thus cutting themselves off from her, they cut themselves off from Christ. She is one with Christ, and if they are not hers, they are not His; for she is the only appointed means of our union with Christ.

It is through the Church that we are united to Christ.

St. Augustine says, 'The Church in fact brings forth all, by baptism, whether in herself, that is, from her own womb, or outside herself by the seed of her husband: (either by herself or by a handmaid).' He adds that Esau, though born of the true wife, was separated from God's people through

Lib. i. de Bapt. cont. Donat. cap. xv. n. 23.

Genesis xxx. 13.

fraternal dissension; whilst Aser, born of a handmaid, but by the right of the wife, received the promises through fraternal concord. 'Thus,' he says, 'amongst those' (outside the Church) 'all who are born are born by the right of the Church which resides in baptism.' *Sicut apud istos Ecclesiæ jure quod est in Baptismo, nascuntur quicumque nascuntur.* If they live in her unity (he adds) they shall reach the land of promise; but if they persevere in dissension, their lot will be with Ismael, who was cast out on account of disagreement with his brother. Elsewhere he states:—'We confess that the baptism of Christ profits a man nothing if he is baptized among heretics or schismatics, and attributes to these same, the baptism he is baptized with; but that it then begins to profit him, when he passes over to the body of Christ, which is the Church of the living God.' *Fatemur nihil prodesse homini baptismum Christi, si apud hereticos vel schismaticos baptizetur, eis ipsis tribuens baptismum quo baptizatur; sed tunc ei prodesse incipere, cùm transit ad corpus Christi, quod est Ecclesia Dei vivi.*—He is speaking of all those who, being separated from the Catholic Church, their true mother, are responsible for remaining so. It is however held that there may be the exceptional case of the outward separation of individual Christians from the body of the Church, through no fault of their own, while they are actually although invisibly united with what has been termed by theologians the Church's soul.

Lib. ii. cont. Crescon. Donat. cap. xxviii. n. 34.

Invincible ignorance.

There are many who, through circumstances over which they have had no control, are outwardly separated from the visible body of Christ; and, thank God, the hope may be indulged that amongst them there are individuals who are prevented by ignorance alone, from availing themselves of the means which God puts within the reach of all for the knowledge of His saving truth. If such persons are ready and disposed at any cost to embrace in full the revelation of God which they have hitherto learnt but in part; if their hearts are prepared to submit to that Church from which ignorance of her divine authority alone keeps them asunder; then, blessed be God, such true souls may be accounted as really, though invisibly, united to the soul of the Church, though deprived of the privilege of her outward communion; and, therefore, as really members of Christ. But no one can presume to judge in any particular case. God alone can read the heart. God alone can discern among those outwardly separated from His only fold, who do or who do not belong to it by this inward bond; for He alone can tell how far each one has done his part to learn His truth, and to know and obey His will.

We have the repeated authority of the Angelic Doctor for asserting, that the mercy of God will not suffer any one to be left without the necessary means for salvation, even in the case of the outwardly unbaptized and heathen. To cite but one out of several passages. In treating of the necessity

of a certain degree of explicit belief, he says, that no difficulty can be raised against this doctrine from the case of any who may have been 'brought up in forests or among brute beasts':—

S. Thom. Aquin. De Veritate, quæst. xiv. De Fide, Art. xi.

'For it appertains to Divine Providence to provide for every one all that is necessary to salvation, so long as the person opposes no impediment on his side. For if any one so brought up should follow the guidance of natural reason in striving after good and avoiding evil, it is most surely to be held (*certissime est tenendum*) that, either by internal inspiration God would reveal to him those things which are necessary to be believed, or would guide to him some preacher of the faith, as He sent Peter to Cornelius. Acts x.'

Individual responsibility.

The mercy of God is infinite, but it does not divest any man of his personal responsibility. It is obvious, that the excuse of ignorance will not avail for one who culpably neglects the means which are afforded to enable him to discern and to enter the true Church, or who wilfully turns aside and shuts his eyes and ears. Nor yet, for one who has doubted the safety of his position, and has not thoroughly examined it; for such a doubt was God's messenger. Men must answer for each such call before their Maker and their Judge Who alone can read the heart.

Human respect.

It is a fearful thought how many trust their souls unhesitatingly to the word of their fellow-men; receiving as God's truth the mere assertion of some individual clergyman, whose learning, or whose zeal and piety, has won their hearts and captivated their understandings. Roman Catholics are

accused of creature worship, which they abhor. How appalling is the extent to which it prevails outside the Church's pale! How appalling the number of men and women who stake their immortal souls for all eternity on the word of some fellow-creature! No Catholic could suffer himself with a safe conscience to be ruled and guided on such a matter, by the simple dictum of any individual whatsoever. He learns indeed the faith from the teachers set over him by the Church, and obeys them as her representatives. But so soon as he should find one of them contradicting another on any essential point, his suspicions would be aroused; and he would at once ascertain from some sure source what was really the divine teaching. No priest or bishop could with a safe conscience permit any more than this, or claim to speak with a mere personal voice on any point of faith; or to affix his own interpretation to any teaching of the Church; or to rule and finally decide any question which might arise as to what that teaching is.[1] God in His mercy has given 'some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors: for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' We are commanded to obey our prelates, to be subject to them, and to follow their faith, and our divine Lord tells us that in hearing them we hear Himself; but this

Eph. iv. 11.

Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

St. Luke x. 16.

[1] Of course, I except (throughout) the case of the Supreme Pontiff, when speaking *ex cathedrâ*.

applies to individual clergy only so far as they speak the same thing with the whole body throughout the universe. Otherwise, says St. Paul,—'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.' This shows the necessity of the living, ever present voice of the Holy Spirit in the Church; by means of which it may at once be made apparent, should any individual pastor speak that which is his own, and not of Jesus Christ—'You are bought with a price, be not made the bond slaves of men.'—'*Let every one prove his own work*, and so shall he have glory in himself only, and not in another. *For every one shall bear his own burden.*'

Gal. i. 8.

1 Cor. vii. 23.

Gal. vi. 4, 5.

Our prelates 'watch as being to render an account of our souls;' yet each one of us must individually answer to God for his own soul.

Heb. xiii. 17.

Corporate bodies of Christians.

The Church is formed of single and separate individual persons, either outwardly and visibly hers, or else belonging to her inward soul in virtue of the exception above referred to, of invincible ignorance. But there can be no *society* of individuals, no corporate body of Christians, which can possibly be united with the Church of Christ, without visible intercommunion. This is evident from the very nature of the case. We have seen that our Lord prayed for permanent visible unity, as a mark of His Divine mission. Now two separate societies, each claiming to be His, and neither of them in outward communion with

the other, would present the spectacle of visible division, and therefore His words would not be verified if both of them belonged to His Church. Both could not be from Him. If Unity is to be visible, we must decide between the two, for one only can make good the claim to His abiding presence. Such is the case before us. Is Christ divided? Can the same Spirit say one thing in Rome, and another thing in England?

There is only one Church.

Unity implies one Church alone, as the visible channel for God's grace. Christ is One, and He is the source of all grace and salvation to mankind. His Body is One. His Spirit is One. His faith is one. The Church is His messenger, the one appointed teacher of His truth, and stewardess of His sacraments. This Church, and this Church's baptism by whomsoever administered, are each of them visibly one. If it be not so, our Lord must have prayed in vain, and the prophecy must have failed which told that He was to die, 'not only for the nation, but to gather together in one the children of God, that were dispersed;' or, according to the Psalmist—'*In conveniendo populos in unum, et reges ut serviant Domino.*'

St. John xi. 52.

Ps. ci. 23.

No society of Christians on earth which is not in outward communion with this one visible Church of Christ, can possess authority to dispense the sacraments, or to preach the faith. For the one Spirit animates one body only, and speaks with one only voice.

The first step is to affirm this fact, and the actual and

perpetual existence of the visible Unity of the Church. The next is to ascertain where that Church is to be found. With God's assistance, it is an easy task, or rather it would be so but for three centuries of prejudice; prejudice the more beguiling, because mixed up with so many hallowed feelings, and with venerated religious teachings from the early days of childhood.

The true Church is not hidden under a bushel.

The one visible Catholic Church being to us what the ark of Noe was to the drowning world, the only appointed means of our salvation, it would be manifestly inconsistent with the mercy, and even with the justice, of God, to leave mankind in uncertainty as to which, among the various communities of Christians, is really the mystical body of His Son, and the only guide to heaven. When the Divine mind, in Its awful simplicity and most loving wisdom, planned and willed the salvation of the human race, It never can have intended that, in these last days, the very path that leads to heaven should become hidden under the mists of doubt, and rendered undiscernible amid the conflicting claims of rival parties. If it were so, then must our Lord's Gospel have lost its characteristic mark, that it is preached to the poor. If it be necessary to enter into a recondite study of history and the early fathers, and to examine with nicety into disputed questions extending over a period of more than eighteen centuries and a half, in order to ascertain which of the contending bodies of Christians is really the teacher come from God; then, indeed, it is evident that Christianity cannot have been the

religion contemplated by the prophet when he foretold :—

'God Himself will come and will save you. Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be free: for waters are broken out in the desert, and streams in the wilderness. . . . . And a path and a way shall be there, and it shall be called the holy way: the unclean shall not pass over it, and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein.' Isaias xxxv. 4–8.

'In the last days,' says the same prophet, 'the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go, and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for the law shall come forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. . . . . O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord.' Is. ii. 2–5.

This passage appears to point directly to the Apostolic see—the new Jerusalem—the city of the great King; for where else do all nations now go up? The prophet Micheas uses the self-same language. Mich. iv. 1, 2.

Thus speaks the sure word of prophecy, not obscurely, but, as the Lord said to Habacuc,—'Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables: that he that readeth it may run over it.' Hab. ii. 2.

St. John Chrysostom says:—'Neither the sun, nor the sun's light, is so plain, as what regards the Church. For the *house of the Lord* is *on the tops of the* St. John Chrysostom Hom. on Is. ii. n. 2.

mountains.'[1] And again :—'It is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched, than for the Church to be made invisible.'[2]

St. Matt. v. 13, 14.

This is that Church which our Lord designates as 'the salt of the earth'—'the light of the world;' adding :—'A city seated on a mountain cannot be hid.' He tells us that,—'As the lightning that lighteneth from under heaven, shineth unto the parts that are under heaven, so shall the Son of man be in His day.' 'The Church of Christ,' as St. Athanasius comments on the Psalmist, 'shall shine like the lightning, and enlighten all under heaven, and shall abide unceasingly, like the sun and the moon.' St. Augustine declares :—'THE TRUE CHURCH is hidden from no one. Hence comes that which He Himself says in the Gospel :—"A city planted on a mountain cannot be hid." Wherefore it is said in the Psalm :—*He hath set His tabernacle in the sun;* that is, in manifestation.' Again, to the Donatist Severinus, he writes, as a Catholic might write to an Anglican :—

St. Luke xvii. 24.

S. Athanasius in Psalm lxxxviii. 38.

S. Aug. cont. lit. Petil. lib. ii. n. 74.

Ps. xviii. 6.

S. Augustini Ep. lii. ad Severinum.

'How deplorable it is that we, who are brethren in the flesh, live not in the body of Christ in one society, especially since it is easy for thee to give heed to and see the city placed upon a mountain, concerning which the Lord says in the Gospel, that it cannot be hid. For it is the Catholic Church itself, whence in Greek it is called καθολική, since it is spread throughout the whole world. To no one is it allowed to be ignorant of this Church, therefore (*ideo*), according to the word of our Lord Jesus Christ, it cannot be hid.'

[1] Quoted by Waterworth, *Faith of Catholics*, vol. i. p. 235.
[2] Ibid. p. 198, as from T. vi. Hom. iv. n. 2.

Our moral sense at once rejects the idea that our Blessed Lord, Who 'came into this world to save sinners,' can have left His Church without credentials sufficient for all who desire that salvation. For to her alone he gave the commission to preach His Gospel, and to administer His saving sacraments.

I. Tim. i. 15.

Manifest claims of Rome.

Now, in fact, there is but one community of Christians which visibly fulfils that commission; or which bears, prominently in all her conduct, and manifestly to the eyes of all men, the charter of her divine authority and power, conveyed to her by the words of Christ:—

St. Matt. xxviii. 18–20.

'And Jesus coming spoke to them, saying: All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.

'Going therefore teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,

'Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.'

Christ's commission to His Church.

The authority to teach which is conveyed by this commission is given to none besides that body of men to whom it is addressed. It extends throughout all time and over all nations, and it regards not only faith, but practice—'Teaching them,' says Christ, 'to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' He adds a promise to be always with that body to the end, and thus ensures to it a never-failing infallibility, which His command to teach, indeed, of itself conveys, for no mere fallible teaching could be relied upon as divine.

It is only Rome which acts on this commission.

It cannot be denied that the Roman Catholic Church is the one only community of Christians which practically manifests faith in this divine commission, and whose faith and whose claim have received the corroborative testimony of the world-wide, everlasting, workings of Divine Providence in her behalf. There may be others who claim to be the One Church, others who style themselves Apostolic, or Catholic, others who call themselves infallible; but there is none other which, in the strength and by the command of the Lord God, goes forth in all the beauty and power of holiness to teach and to rule the consciences and hearts of men over the face of the whole globe, and to guide and control their moral actions. Sweetly and strongly and surely she advances onward, like her Lord in the vision,—'conquering that He might conquer.' Conquering all hearts for Him! The very by-words of reproach which are heaped upon her by the world, testify to this most evident truth. Her enemies say that she is aggressive and exclusive—a claimant to infallibility and to rule. And they say true. She is so, and Christianity is so. She is the very personification of Christianity, which is one, and aggressive, and infallible, and has a rule to which no earthly monarch can approach, the rule over men's hearts, and therefore the world hates it. Rome *is* all this, and she *acts* accordingly, as none other dares to act; if she did not do so, by that very fact she would be self-condemned, as all her pretended rivals are; for not one of them fulfils these duties, which are nevertheless

Apoc. vi. 2.

inherent in Christ's commission. That commission was addressed to one only body of men; it was, therefore, exclusive. It commanded them to teach Christ's faith, and to cause His commandments to be observed throughout all nations; therefore, it was aggressive. The command not only gave infallibility by its own virtue and in itself, for otherwise it could not have been obeyed, but there was also expressly connected with it a promise of the Divine assistance, for all time:—'*Behold I am with you all days.*' Therefore Christ's Church must always be infallible, and always practically assert herself to be so, and none can be Christ's Church which fails, in practice, to claim infallibility, since it is essential in order to command men's faith. Cursed is he that trusts in man. Unless a Church makes known that she speaks with the infallibility of an ever-present God, what claim has she on man's belief? Men could not trust their souls to one whose voice was not the voice of God.

The whole commission was conferred for the salvation of mankind, and the one who possesses it can therefore never cease to proclaim it and to act upon it, for otherwise mankind could not profit by it. Rome alone both proclaims it and acts on it. Therefore the world calls her arrogant; and the good see in her, visibly, the teacher both promised and sent from God. It was so with her Divine Master; it will be so till the end; and it is a characteristic of the truth. Hers alone is that universal empire, universal alike in time and in extent, which the prophecies proclaim

as the heritage of Christ and of His spouse. It is hers because it is His. On Him are bestowed 'the Gentiles for His inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for His possession;' and she alone it is who, in every clime, in every nation, asserts this rule of love; extends this spiritual kingdom; and with the consciousness of God's authority demands an undivided allegiance of the heart from every soul of man; calling him, if heathen, into her fold; if Christian, to her maternal bosom, by whomsoever he may have been baptized, or wheresoever he may be found. I say again, whatever others may hold in theory, it is a visible fact, that, in practice and in reality, the Roman Catholic Church alone maintains and urges those necessary claims which form a portion of the very charter of Christianity. All others, in their conduct, if not in their words, say practically:—This exclusive, universal, unerring rule is not for me! Therefore it is that the world hates none of them as it hates the One Church of God, and as it hated the One Christ.

Ps. ii. 8.

Here, then, is the house of the Lord on the top of the mountains; 'the kingdom that shall never be destroyed;' 'the one fold under the one shepherd.' Here alone are united the four notes of Christ's true Church, defined in the Nicene Creed:—*Credo Unam Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.*

Dan. ii. 44.

St. John x. 16.

The Church's Unity.

The unity of the Blessed Trinity is the pattern of the Church's unity.—'One as We also are One.'—

Such was the prayer of our Lord to His Father. This unity, therefore, must be complete, and of a divine intensity. It could not subsist without the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost, uniting the many members of Christ's mystical body to each other and to God, by the threefold bond of one faith, one hope, one love. Without such unity the Church could not fulfil her office. She has received God's commission to teach the nations. She could not do so if she spoke with a divided voice. Her pastors could not preach one faith unless, being divinely taught, they were at one amongst themselves as to the articles of that faith.

Rome and England.

The consideration of the absence of such agreement between the established English Church and Rome, might seem sufficient to dispel the dream of any real though unseen unity between those two communions. It is idle to reply that they are agreed on fundamentals. They are not even agreed as to what fundamentals are. For the present I need go no further than the article of faith, which declares the divine authority of the see of St. Peter, to rule, and govern, and teach the universal Church. This is a fundamental doctrine of the Roman creed. The national Church of England is based on the principle of its rejection. Surely there cannot be any unity of spirit between two societies which contradict each other on a point of faith, as to the essential constitution of the Church itself. Such contradiction affects the very essence and ground work of Christian

faith, which consists in the belief of everything that God has revealed, because He has revealed it. This faith, therefore, requires certainty respecting the appointed channel of God's revelation, and any difference respecting the definition of that channel is incompatible with unity of faith. One who is convinced by his own private judgment of the truth of all the Roman Catholic doctrines, save that of the infallibility of the Church in subjection to the Roman See, cannot have divine faith in all those truths, nor be, even so far, one in the faith with those who believe them because they have been revealed by God through His Church.

External differences among members of the Church.

Superficial writers have professed to discern marks of a want of unity among Roman Catholics, in the passing external differences or dissensions which occasionally meet the eye. One might imagine it had escaped their notice that Catholics do not deny that they are frail and erring mortals, and liable, like others, to all the ills this flesh is heir to. We do not profess to be individually exempt from human weakness and human faults, although we glory in the strength of a divine presence, whose 'power is made perfect in infirmity.' We are but men; but 'in the midst of us is Christ our God'! The Church is an abiding miracle. From its very commencement, its whole life is a testimony to the power of God displayed through weak and erring instruments. If her members were already supernaturally perfect, the miracle would cease. So long as they remain

II. Cor. xii. 9.

imperfect, it is impossible that their imperfections can escape notice. But these imperfections are individual; these dissensions or differences between man and man, or between one section of men and another within the Church's pale, no more affect the divine unity of the whole body, than the wind which ruffles the surface of the ocean affects the oneness of its universal waters.

I am speaking of differences amongst the good. The Church on earth comprises a mixed multitude, and will do so till the end of all things. Between good and evil, wherever they are found, there must always be a contest. Yet even Catholics of bad moral conduct do not differ from the good as to points of faith; or as to the rule of life which they know they ought to follow. So that however inconsistent their behaviour, they manifest no divergence of doctrine. Nor can any such divergence be gathered from the differences which frequently arise amongst the morally good. It has happened, indeed, that good men have been led astray, in opinion, as was the great Fenelon; but like Fenelon also they have submitted when their error was condemned. Any who, in such case, persist, are manifestly unsound members; and some, like Lammenais, have fallen, and have cut themselves off from unity. But such cases of defection, however sad, whether of individuals or of multitudes, do not impair in the slightest the unity of the Church they have disobeyed. The tree continues one, though the storm may rend its branches.

It has happened, too, that matters in themselves indifferent, have occasionally assumed an importance not their own through their connection with particular interests, and have been argued so warmly on both sides as to induce authority to interfere and forbid all further discussion upon the subject. To this class belong the questions as to whether the prophet Elias was the founder of the Carmelites; and as to the form of the habit worn by St. Francis; which at one time were sources of contention.

Inconsistency of the charges against the Catholic system.

St. Luke vii. 31–35.

So long as men are men, these things will be; and on this subject, as on most others, the Church can adopt the language of her Master:—'And the Lord said: Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like? They are like to children sitting in the market-place, and speaking one to another, and saying: We have piped to you, and you have not danced: we have mourned, and you have not wept. For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and you say: He hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking; and you say: Behold a man that is a glutton and a drinker of wine, a friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified by all her children.'

If Roman Catholics point to their world-wide agreement on all essentials, they are charged with the rigid immobility of enforced dogma; with a Procrustean system ready cut and dried. If they exhibit signs of movement and of thought, and show a con-

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

sequent difference of opinion, they are forthwith accused of internal divisions and suicidal discord. But 'wisdom is justified by all her children.' The greater the activity of men's thoughts, the more numerous will be their differences of opinion on every conceivable subject,—history, science, art, politics, and even (as regards open questions) on points of theology itself. Hence spring the friendly controversies on such matters between one school and another, one religious order and another, one theologian and another, all equally faithful to the one true Church—all equally united in her outward and inward communion. She approves of such discussions (which, so long as they are conducted in a spirit of charity and deference to authority, are most serviceable to truth), whilst, like a watchful mother she looks on, and keeps them within due bounds. Men naturally have different opinions also on matters of taste and feeling, on external forms and styles of devotion, on the decoration of churches, on architecture, ritual, and the rest, and even on the line of conduct to be followed under the circumstances of the day. Differences existed in the apostolic age; nay, they sprang up even between apostles. The dissension which arose between St. Paul and St. Barnabas was such that 'they departed one from another.' Yet unity was not impaired, though the difference was so serious; for they continued one in the faith, and in the visible commu- Acts xv. 39.

nion of the Church. Such differences form one of the troubles of our lot on earth; but if these miseries did not exist in her, the Church would not be human, and if they penetrated below the surface, she could not be divine. She has her 'treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency may be of the power of God, and not of herself.' The very existence of these occasional external differences amongst her members is a test of her divine mission. If God were not within her, man's weakness would have turned such dissension into division long centuries ago. As it is, they are but on the surface, and only partial even there; arising often from some local cause, or peculiar circumstance, and therefore frequently far shorter-lived than are the men themselves who take part in them.

II. Cor. iv. 7.

The universal Unity of the Catholic Church.

The enquirer after truth may search throughout the world; he may travel north, south, east, and west; visit Europe, Asia, Africa, and America; go through France, Spain, Italy, Germany, England, Ireland, Scotland, the Arctic regions, and the Antipodes; he may go everywhere, and ask every Catholic he meets, cleric or layman, religious or secular, Benedictine, Augustinian, Franciscan, Dominican, Jesuit, Carmelite, or any other; young or old, learned or unlearned, all who have been taught the rudiments of their religion, he may ask them respecting their faith, respecting their practice, respecting the sacraments and all that concerns religion, and, from one and all, the answer will be the same. Everywhere on the face

of the globe, amongst good and pious Roman Catholics, though they may be utter strangers to each other in the flesh, and divided in temporal position as far as men can be divided from their fellow-men, there will be found one and the self-same faith, one and the self-same rule of morals, the self-same sacraments, and the self-same belief respecting those sacraments; there will be found but one mind, one heart, and one voice, as regards all the doctrines and commandments of the Church. This is unity, and it is divine; it is no mere human coincidence or contrivance. The finger of God is here, reversing the confusion of Babel. It is the unity of God's one Church throughout the universal globe; and it has been her unity through more than eighteen centuries and a half. It is a matter to be looked to, and a test to be applied, for the absence of such unity denotes the absence of God. He cannot speak with a divided tongue; He dwells not amid contradictions; He is everywhere one and the same.—'His place is in peace: and His abode in Sion:' in the city He has constituted as the one fold under one shepherd:—*Jerusalem, quæ ædificatur ut civitas; cujus participatio ejus in idipsum.*

Ps. lxxv. 2.

Ps. cxxi. 3.

Sanctity.

God's Church is holy: holy with the holiness of supernatural grace. This clothes her with a brightness that wholly covers the short-comings of too many of her children, who, though in her, unhappily testify by their lives, that they are not

of her. Our Lord has warned us of this scandal. But in spite of it she is pre-eminently holy, and manifestly so to the whole world. Natural goodness may be found elsewhere; but that superhuman lustre that shines like the stars of heaven, can glisten in her firmament alone. Who can count that royal list of saints, nobler than earth's noblest, who glory in her as a mother? Derived from every rank and every calling, from every clime and every language; from the fisherman at his nets, and the publican at his office, to the monarch on the throne, and the philosopher in the schools. Now a simple shepherdess, now a noble matron, or high-exalted queen, now a converted sinner; it would be endless to recount the varieties or to tell the names of all the heroes and heroines of sanctity, whose acts adorn the robes of that one holy Church still ruled over and fed by Peter in his successors. To pass by the early ages, where else will be found a St. Elizabeth of Hungary, a St. Louis of France, a St. Clare, a St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi, a St. Margaret of Cortona, a St. Ignatius of Loyola, a St. Francis Xavier, a St. Edward Confessor, a St. Thomas of Canterbury, a St. Theresa, a St. Rose of Lima, and countless others? Where else can be found the bright-robed army of martyrs down even to the present age? All the miraculous creations of God's grace belong exclusively to the Roman communion.

External testimony.

Nay, Anglicans themselves being witnesses,—to what source do they turn when endeavouring to revive

former holiness of life? To whom do they look for a pattern but to the holy Roman Church? It is her ritual, her forms, her sacraments, her doctrine (save on the few essential points which they reject), her religious orders, her works of mercy, her devotions to a great extent, that they seek to adapt to their own use. For this they gladly bear reproach, for this they toil. They fly to Rome for well nigh everything but the sweet protection and shadowing tender care of her maternal authority. This holds true, though not in the same measure, of every school which has yearned after greater holiness,—of every effort after a higher standard of religious life. It holds true of the so-called evangelicals; for though they thought not of it, yet in their teaching on the necessity of prayer and meditation; on the passion of our blessed Lord, and on the great mysteries of man's redemption; in their zeal for maintaining the essential doctrines of the incarnation and divinity of Christ; in the spirituality of their religion; in their pious lives and active labours; in all these respects they followed in the track of that very Rome, whom in their blindness they looked upon as anti-christian. This holds true of all earnest Christian teaching and practice. The Church of Rome has throughout been the guardian of the saving truths of Christianity. History has recorded the fact in pages which can never be effaced. The Church of Rome kept alive, through ages of iron, the sacred fire of the true religion of the heart; the adoration of God in spirit and in truth; earnestness and piety of life;

the burning love of Jesus; an apostolic zeal rendered the more sure and efficacious by discipline, and by the superhuman prudence and discretion which regulates and directs it. The source of every really religious movement may be traced to the fostering care of Rome. If Rome could be abstracted from Christendom, and from Christendom's history, how much of Christendom would be left? If Rome's teaching and Rome's practices were to be abstracted from Christianity; in other words, if from every communion of Christians there were to be taken away all that is there held in common with Rome, what then would be found remaining? A mere negation! All that is positive would be gone; there would be left mere human nothingness. On the other hand, if all be supposed to be taken away from Rome which others hold in common with her, the truths and the virtues she would retain must be recognised as fragments of a complete and divine system; and what was left would prove her title to what was gone, from the evident connection between the two.

Intrinsic, not *imported*, holiness is an essential note of the Church of Christ. She is the channel of holiness and she is holy:—'*The Most High hath sanctified His own tabernacle. God is in the midst thereof.*'

Ps. xlv. 5, 6.

Catholicity.

The Church of Christ is Catholic in time, and in space also. She is coeval with the world. 'The beginning of all things,' says St. Epiphanius, 'is the Catholic and Holy Church.' She is to endure for all

Adv. Hæres. i. 1, 5.

ages. 'Behold,' said our Lord, 'I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' In extent she knows no limits, save the *orbis terrarum*. 'Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature.' Such is her charter from Christ. Her realm reaches on beyond the grave, and death does not sever her children from her. Her mission is to the whole human race, irrespective of human nationalities. Her empire is universal; it comprises all mankind. She is neither French, English, German, nor Spanish; nor is she Asiatic or European, African or American; but still she includes them all: and if she glories in the name of Roman, it is only because Rome is the seat of Peter, and, as St. Ambrose testifies,—*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.*

St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

St. Mark xvi. 15.

In Ps. xl. n. 30.

Rome is the centre of Catholicity.

Peter is everywhere, and the Church is everywhere; her kingdom is not of this world, but it absorbs all earthly kingdoms in its spiritual dominion, which is extended over the whole globe. Besides the many countries in professed communion with Rome, in every nation and in every clime the faith of Peter is proclaimed, the authority of Peter has its willing subjects, and the bark of Peter is present to rescue and to save. Even in lands where schism and heresy prevail, the Church under Peter's rule ceases not to seek the wanderers; to comfort, and support, and cheer the weak. Her children, scattered far and wide over the earth, may not even know each other in the flesh, yet are they one in that omnipresent fold, and known, each one, to that true and careful

mother, who is literally κατὰ τὸ ὅλον, for she overspreads and interpenetrates the universe.

The cross which was erected on Calvary by our Divine Master, was to be planted by His command in the centre of the world—in imperial Rome—by the Apostle whose humility obtained that its position should be reversed; for his high exaltation demanded a corresponding self-abasement. It is in the soil of Rome that the grain of mustard-seed has grown up into the goodly tree, whose roots are nourished by the most precious blood of Jesus, and whose branches have filled the whole earth, so that the birds of the air, even the Saints of God in all lands, find shelter and fruit amongst them.

Title of Catholic.

What claim has any religious communion save the Roman to the title of Catholic? As a matter of fact, on what ground can that title be maintained by any other? St. Augustine's and St. Cyril's test will hold good still; for, though it may occasionally happen to an enquirer after a Catholic Church, to fall in with one who makes as if he did not understand him to mean the Roman, such ignorance does not actually exist; it will be a mere pretence. If a Roman Catholic speaks of the Catholic Church, there are those who will make haste to tell him to add Roman, thereby proving how well they understand him: yet the world has not room for two Catholic Churches, if the term Catholic really means universal. It is, however, maintained by Anglicans that the Christians in communion with Rome are only a part of the

Church, and have no right to claim to be the whole. This argument may be answered in the self-same words made use of by St. Augustine to the Donatist Bishop, Petilian :—

'You, with closed eyes, so stumble against that mountain, which, from a small stone, according to the prophecy of Daniel, has increased and has filled the whole earth, as to say to us that we have sunk into a part and are not in the whole; to us whose communion is spread abroad over the universal globe. But, in like manner, as if you were to say to me that I am Petilian, I could not tell how to answer you, except by laughing as if you were in joke, or else pitying you as if you were insane, so now, this is all I find to be done. Since, however, I do not believe you are in joke, you see the alternative.' Contra Lit. Petil. lib. ii. No. 91.

God Himself, Who is the model and the maintainer of the Church's unity, is also the Author of her universality. He has made her as necessary to the spiritual life of man as the sun is to his physical, and, like God's glorious sun, she shines for all. Of her preachers it is written :—'*Their sound is gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world.*' Romans x. 18.

But '*how shall they preach unless they be sent?*' The word Apostle means Ambassador. No Church can be Apostolic which is not sent by Christ through His ambassadors, the Apostles. Many of those who admit the necessity of the Apostolical succession as regards orders, appear to make very light of it as regards mission and jurisdiction. It would lead me too far if I were to enter upon the question of the Apostolicity. Rom. x. 15.

validity of the Church of England orders. Suffice it to say, that Rome's disbelief in them must be very certain, otherwise she would not unconditionally ordain those Anglican clergymen who, being reconciled to her, are called to her priesthood; for she accounts it sacrilege to repeat the sacrament of orders.

Orders do not give Mission, nor confer Jurisdiction.

But orders do not in themselves contain the Apostolic mission, though they are indispensable in order to render the recipients capable of exercising it when bestowed upon them. Still less do they convey jurisdiction, or confer power upon a priest to administer the sacrament of penance where he does not possess jurisdiction. The confessional is a tribunal, the priest a judge; and this of necessity requires the right of judging in the particular case before him; in other words, of jurisdiction over the penitent. Now, ordination does not convey this jurisdiction, though it confers the power of exercising it when given. No priest can validly exercise the power of the keys, excepting under those circumstances for which he has received jurisdiction from competent ecclesiastical authority. This has always been held in the Church, and both Greeks and Latins are perfectly agreed upon it.[1] Absence of the necessary jurisdiction would invalidate the priestly absolution.

Nor can Bishops themselves exercise jurisdiction beyond the limits assigned to them by Apostolic

[1] *Elementa Theol. Dogmat.* op. F. X. Schouppe, S.J.—Bruxelles, 1863—a most useful and accurate compendium, possessing high recommendations of authority. T. ii. pp. 356–7.

authority, which is vested in the Roman Pontiff. If in any case they seem to have done so, it must be presumed that they were authorised, tacitly at the least, by the Apostolic See of Rome; to whose decision, as it is well known, all disputes upon such questions have always been referred.

Definition of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

It is most important to bear in mind that the special privilege and authority divinely conferred on the Apostolic See of St. Peter is one of dignity, and of jurisdiction; not of order. Every Bishop is as much a Bishop as the Pope, as regards the Episcopal *order*; but no other Bishop possesses the dignity or the universal jurisdiction of the Pope, who has succeeded to the plenitude of the Apostolic power and mission conferred by Christ Himself upon St. Peter. The Primacy has been defined by Fr. Schouppe, as—

Elem. Theol. Dogm. T. i. pp. 226–7.

'*The pre-eminence by which the Roman Pontiff obtains, by divine right, not only honour and dignity, but also jurisdiction and power, throughout the Universal Church.—It is said*: by which he obtains *honour and dignity*, such, for instance, as that which an Emperor enjoys among Kings who are not his subjects; a man of nobility among commoners; the president of a college among his fellow-colleagues.—It is said: *he obtains jurisdiction and power*, such, indeed, as any Prince or magistrate enjoys towards subordinate officers: thus, a King holds the primacy among all the Princes who are subject to him.'

Necessity of rightful jurisdiction.

It needs but a slight acquaintance with the maxims, rules, and practices of the universal Church, to be aware that rightful jurisdiction was always considered essential for the due exercise of the Episcopal

functions; and that such jurisdiction might be forfeited, or withdrawn by competent authority, though the sacred orders must always remain. Since this is a fact which cannot be contradicted, it surely becomes a matter of supremest moment for English Churchmen to examine and to resolve, not merely the question of the validity of their orders, but that also of the authority and validity of the mission and jurisdiction exercised by their Bishops and clergy at the present time. If they heed the voice of the Universal Church at all, they must be convinced that this is a vital point.[1] The pages of history render it evident beyond a doubt, that the two rival claimants between whom they have to choose, as the respective channels of Divine mission and of spiritual jurisdiction, are; on the one hand,—the Apostolic throne of Peter; and on the other,—the Royal throne of Elizabeth. This is not a rhetorical figure; it is a manifest fact.

Necessity of Apostolic Doctrine.

There is a necessary succession of doctrine as well as of orders, and apart from the Apostolic communion we have no guarantee for the Apostolic faith. The Apostles alone received from Christ that great *depositum*, with the assistance of His Spirit to keep it uncorrupt for all time. Now, the Apostolic College is represented to us by its head, and it is to the successors of

[1] This might be urged, on lower ecclesiastical grounds, even apart from the divinely constituted Primacy of St. Peter; as is clearly shown, in an essay deserving of closest attention, by the late Cardinal Wiseman, on *Anglican Claims of Apostolical Succession*. Essays by H.E. Card. Wiseman. Dolman, 1853, vol. ii. p. 161. It first appeared in the *Dublin Review*; Oct. 1838.

the blessed Peter we must look for instruction in the faith once delivered to the Saints. Even apart from this his distinct office, there is no other Apostolic See which God has left upon the earth, in a position for us to consult. The chair of St. Peter alone amongst all the Apostles, by a special privilege still survives to us in a long line of successors; a fact which of itself seems to indicate, that the custody of the faith and the rule of the Church were divinely committed to that favoured See, pre-eminently above the rest.

Amongst the Apostolic chairs, St. Peter's alone remains to us.

To refer to the teaching of Pope Pius VI.:—

'That the Church was founded by Christ on the firmness of the Rock; and that, by the singular favour of Christ, Peter was selected above the rest to be by vicarious power the Prince of the Apostolic Choir; and therefore to receive the supreme charge and authority, to be perpetuated through his successors for all time, of feeding the whole flock, of confirming his brethren, and of binding and loosing over the whole earth—is a *Catholic Dogma*, which, having been received from the mouth of Christ and handed down and defended by the constant teaching of the Fathers, the Universal Church has always held most inviolably, and frequently confirmed against the errors of innovators by the decrees of Sovereign Pontiffs and Councils.'

Constitution, 28th November, 1786.[1]

The Episcopal order is possessed in its fulness without the Apostolate. The Apostolate was possessed in its fulness without the Primacy. The Primacy includes the other two, but yet it is distinct from them. Every

St. Peter's office.

[1] Quoted in vol. iii. p. 227 of the *Irish Annual Miscellany*, at the commencement of an invaluable Essay on *The Supremacy of St. Peter and his Successors*, by Dr. Murray, Professor of Theology at Maynooth. I thankfully acknowledge my obligations to the said Essay, and earnestly recommend its careful perusal.

Bishop is a true successor of the Apostles, but the extent of his jurisdiction and mission is limited. It is only in council, in union with his fellow-Bishops under the Roman Pontiff, that he collectively exercises wider powers. All the Apostles received from Christ not only the Episcopal order, but also, by a distinct act, universal jurisdiction and universal mission to 'all nations;'—'*As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.*' These universal powers, which are not conferred on other Bishops, were conferred on each and all of the Apostles, for the purpose of founding the Universal Church. They were to be exercised, however, in union with, and in subordination to, the still higher and distinct office conferred upon St. Peter.

St. Matt. xxviii. 19. St. John xx. 21.

A.D. 440-461.

Hence the great St. Leo teaches that—

Serm. iv. cap. 2, in anniv. ejusdem assumptionis.

'Out of the whole world, Peter alone is chosen, who should be set over both the vocation of the universal nations, and all the Apostles, and all the fathers of the Church: that, although among the people of God there are many priests and pastors; yet Peter, in his own person (*proprie*), may rule all those whom Christ also rules as the Head (*principaliter*). A great and marvellous fellowship in Its own power, most dearly beloved, has the Divine estimation (*dignatio*) conferred upon this man; and if It willed that the other princes should possess anything in common with him, it never, except through him, gave to the others whatever it did not refuse them.'

The Primacy.

Thus St. Peter received from Christ not only the Episcopal order and the Apostolate in common with the others; but, over and above these princely gifts, he, and he alone, received for himself and his succes-

sors, the supreme office, and the consequent plenitude of power and sufficiency of grace, whereby to feed, to rule, and to govern the Universal Church. As Bishops and as Apostles they all were equal, but as Prince of the Apostles and as Vicar of Christ after His departure, St. Peter was raised above them all.

The Episcopal order is an essential part of the Divine hierarchy of the Church, and must always continue in its plenitude. But the Apostolic work of the foundation of the Church has been accomplished, and so far, therefore, the Apostolate has ceased. That is to say, the universal mission and jurisdiction conferred on each and all of the Apostles has not been continued to their successors, excepting in the case of their head, the blessed Peter. The Apostolate was more extensive than the Episcopate, and the Primacy was over and above the Apostolate. It concerned not only the foundation of the Universal Church, but its preservation and its unity for all ages, and therefore it could never cease. St. Peter and his successors for evermore were constituted the Vicars of Christ. Not *Successors* of Christ, but *Vicars*. Christ still rules His Church, but he does so through the successors of Peter. The Apostles were associated with Peter in establishing and governing the Church, but they were subordinate to him as the representative of Christ.

Apostolic privileges. Apoc. xxi. 14.

The wall of the new Jerusalem in the Apocalypse 'had twelve foundations, and in them, the twelve names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb:' and it was

St. Matt. xix. 28. said to them by their Divine Master—'When the Son of man shall sit on the seat of His majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' These are Apostolic privileges in which they all are equal: and that Holy Church regards and venerates them still as her rulers in union with blessed Peter, is evident from the words of her liturgical Preface on their feasts, wherein she beseeches God that 'He the eternal Pastor will not desert His flock, but that through His blessed Apostles He will defend it with His continual protection. That it may be governed by the same rulers whom, as Vicars of Thy work, Thou hast employed as Pastors to preside over the same.' St. Paul also tells us that we are 'built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.'

Missale Romanum.

Eph. ii. 20.

St. Peter the foundation.

It is from his union with that corner stone that St. Peter is what he is. As, when on earth, our Lord associated him with Himself in the payment of the tribute, saying—'Take that, and give it to them for *me and thee*,'—so has He associated him with Himself as the rock on which the Church is built, the corner stone by which she is held together. 'Other foundation,' says the Apostle, 'no man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus.' Yet Jesus united Peter to Himself, and made him the visible minister of His own Divine work. Thus in the continuation of the sermon already quoted, St. Leo speaks as follows:—

St. Matt. xvii. 26.

I. Cor. iii. 11.

Ubi supra, p. 46. '*I*, Christ says, *say to thee*' (Peter): 'that is, as my

Father has manifested to thee my divinity, so I also make known to thee thy excellence. *That thou art Peter*: that is, though I am the inviolable rock; I, *the corner stone who make both one*; I, the foundation besides which no man can lay another;—yet thou also art the rock, because thou shalt be made firm by my strength, that those things which by my power are my own, may be thine in common, by participation with me.'

Elsewhere, the same holy Pontiff teaches:—

Epist. x. ad Episcopos per Provinc. Vienn. constitutos.

'The Lord willed that the sacrament of this charge' (preaching the gospel) 'should appertain to the office of all the Apostles, with the understanding that He vested it principally in the most blessed Peter, the chief of all the Apostles; and He wills His gifts to flow into the whole body from the same, as from a head; that whoso should dare to withdraw from the solidity of Peter might understand that he has no part in the divine mystery. For He willed that this man, whom He had taken into the fellowship of an inseparable unity, should be named that which He Himself was, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.*'

Christ is all in all.

Our Lord, indeed, is not only the foundation but the founder of His Church, which He has purchased with His most precious blood, and established upon Peter by His own power. All that Peter and others are, they are, not in their own strength, but in Christ's. In this Christ necessarily stands alone, but He dispenses His gifts as He will and where He will. His word is power, and when He named Simon—the rock—He made him what he named him. When He promised to build on him the Church against which the gates of hell should not prevail, He bestowed on him an inalienable union with Himself for all time

as the one foundation of that Church; and, as that visible Church was to be gathered from successive generations of men, so, after Peter had followed his Lord both in His cross and in His glory, was it to be founded on the successors of Peter, imperishable and invincible in its basis and in its structure.

St. Peter was made the Head.

On them, also, was to descend the rule over the whole Church promised to St. Peter under the symbol of the keys, by which our Lord made him again to be a sharer in His own office. The keys are not promised to the Church, but to Peter. It is through Peter that they come to the Church; through Peter that they continue with the Church; and beyond the limits assigned by Peter and his successors their power is not extended.

Supreme authority conveyed by the keys.

St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

Our Lord says, 'On this rock I will build My Church;' and He adds, 'and I will give to *thee* the keys.' He says not, *to her*, i.e. the Church; He says, *to thee*—Peter—thereby setting him over the Church. For the keys convey more than the power of binding and loosing, which, in conjunction with St. Peter, was afterwards bestowed on the other Apostles; they convey supreme authority over the exercise of that power.

Apoc. i. 18.

Thus, in the Apocalypse, our Lord speaks of Himself as having 'the keys of death and of hell;' and again,

Ibid. iii. 7.

as 'He that hath the key of David; He that openeth, and no man shutteth; shutteth, and no man openeth.' The power of the keys *includes* both the power of binding and loosing, and also the control over the exercise of that power by others. When St. Peter's

keys open, none other can shut; when they shut, none other can open. It is not so with any other, for all others are subordinate to Peter. God says of Eliacim in the prophecy,—'He shall be as a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Juda. And I will lay *the key* of the house of David upon his shoulder: and he shall open and none shall shut: and he shall shut, and none shall open.' Primarily, this prefigured Christ; secondarily, His servant Peter. He made Peter His representative, as He had before chosen Eliacim to be His type.

Isaias xxii. 21, 22.

St. Peter named the first.

Throughout the Gospels, the priority given to St. Peter is most apparent. In the lists of the Apostles his name is invariably first. Thus, in St. Matthew,—'The first, Simon who is called Peter'—in the vulgate, *primus*—in the Greek, πρῶτος. So, too, we find frequently such expressions as—'Simon and they that were with him.'—'Peter and they that were with him.' Again, when the women sought their risen Lord in the sepulchre, they were told by the angel,—'Go, tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee.' Why should Peter be especially named here, excepting as the leader and representative of the Apostles? St. Gregory the Great gives it, indeed, as a reason, that our Lord, in His loving tenderness, wished to encourage him after his fall and deep repentance. But, so far from ignoring the primacy, he goes on to explain why God permitted such a fall in the case of one

St. Matt. x. 2.

St. Mark i. 36. St. Luke viii. 45; ix. 32.

St. Mark xvi. 7.

whom he intended to set over the whole Church. He comments on the passage as follows:—

Hom. in Evang. xxi. 4.

Why St. Peter was allowed to fall.

'We must inquire why, when the disciples are mentioned, Peter is marked out by name. But, if the angel had not expressly named him who had denied his Master, he would not have dared to come among the disciples. Therefore he is called by name, lest he should despair on account of his denial. In which matter we must consider why Almighty God permitted him, whom He had determined to set over the entire church (*quem cunctæ Ecclesiæ præferre disposuerat*), to be affrighted at the voice of a servant girl, and to deny Himself. Which, in truth, we perceive to have been done by a most merciful dispensation; in order that he who was the future Pastor of the Church should learn, through his own fault, how he ought to have compassion upon others. First, therefore, He shows him to himself, and then he set him over the rest, in order that he might learn, from his own infirmity, how mercifully he should bear with the infirmities of others.'

Heb. iv. 15.

In this, too, was Peter to be made most like his Master, Who, though 'without sin,' was 'tempted in all things like as we are,' and can, therefore, 'have compassion on our infirmities.'

Amongst early ecclesiastical writers the well-known designation of St. Peter is,—Prince of the Apostles. Thus (to quote one out of a multitude), St. Cyril of Jerusalem names him as 'Peter the chiefest (ὁ κορυφαιότατος καὶ πρωτοστάτης) and foremost of the apostles;'—'Key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven.' This chief position was continued to the See of Peter, as St. Augustine testifies when he speaks of 'the Roman Church in which the principality (*princi-*

Catech. ii. 19.

Ibid. xvii. 27.

Ep. xliii. 7.

patus) of the apostolic chair has always remained in vigour (*semper viguit*).'

It is the presence of Christ in His Church which renders her chief pastors collectively, firm and inviolable in the faith; and this office also, which is exercised invisibly by His Spirit, He has conferred upon Peter and his successors as His visible organs. The words of our Lord are explicit. On the very night of His passion, when He prayed for the visible and perpetual unity of His Church, He gave to Peter alone the charge of confirming and consolidating that Church:—'And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have *you* (ὑμᾶς) that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for *thee* (περὶ σοῦ) that *thy* (σοῦ) faith fail not: and *thou* (σὺ) being once converted, confirm thy brethren.' The words vary,—*you*,—and *thee* and *thou*. All were to be attacked by hell; but their strength was to be in one, and that very one who was afterwards to be their strength, was first to display his insufficiency apart from Christ; that the power of Christ might, through all ages, be the more apparent in him through his previous momentary weakness when left to his own support. St. Ambrose, before St. Gregory, taught that the trial was permitted in order to fit St. Peter for his supreme office. He says:—

St. Peter's See is also the strength of the Episcopate.

St. Luke xxii. 31.

In Ps. xliii. 40.

'The adversary is compelled to tempt the Saints of the Lord, to his own loss. For by tempting them he makes them better, that he who is tempted may be able to instruct (*instituere*) others also; even he who, to himself,

Reason for St. Peter's temptation.

appeared infirm. It is *then* that Peter is set over the Church, *after* he was tempted of the devil. And on that account the Lord signifies beforehand what that is, because, afterwards, he elected him Pastor of the Lord's flock. For to him he said: *but thou being converted confirm thy brethren.*'

The good Shepherd.

Our Lord is pre-eminently the good Shepherd. It is one of the most endearing of His titles, and the subject of one of the most touching of His prophecies respecting Himself:—'He shall feed His flock like a shepherd: He shall gather together the lambs with His arm, and shall take them up in His bosom, and He Himself shall carry them that are with young.' This office also, which, spiritually and invisibly, He Himself still fulfils, He has conferred upon Peter and the successors of Peter as His outward and visible agents and ministers. We know how, after the chief Apostle had redeemed his threefold fall by a threefold protestation of love, our blessed Lord Himself committed to him as His own Vicar, the charge of His own flock, by a thrice repeated commission,—'Feed my lambs,' 'Feed my lambs,' 'Feed my sheep,'—Βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου, Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. Feed and rule not only my lambs, but my sheep the mothers of the lambs,—my whole flock. Feed and govern all. The word ποίμαινε (which, in the Greek, has reference to the sheep) is the very same which is applied to our Lord Himself in the prophecy quoted by St. Matthew (chap. ii. 6), and rendered in the English, *rule*;—'that shall rule (ποιμανεῖ) my people Israel.'

Isaias xl. 11.

St. John xxi

There is an account in the diary of Archbishop

Laud, of a conversation between himself and a Catholic on the primacy of St. Peter's See, and how at last the Catholic would make no other answer than the repetition of the words,—*Dabo claves,—Pasce agnos; Pasce oves.*—In truth, no human sophistry can elude the divine simplicity and force of our Lord's promise of supreme power, which was symbolized by the keys; nor explain away the fact of its completion and fulfilment in the final committal of the whole Church to the pastoral care and rule of Peter, which included the charge of confirming and maintaining in the faith his venerable brethren, the Episcopate of the whole world. Moreover it is manifest from the very nature of this commission, that it was to descend in its fulness upon each succeeding occupant of St. Peter's See, so long as there should be a flock to feed and to defend, to guide and to rule over.

The office promised and conferred.

It is not man, it is Christ Himself Who, in these His pastors, still holds the keys, and feeds and rules His flock. Thus, the Roman Catechism teaches of the Church, that 'its ruler and governor is one, Christ indeed invisibly, whom the Eternal Father "hath made Head over all the Church, which is His Body"; but visibly, the occupant of the Roman See, the legitimate successor of Peter Prince of the Apostles.'

Christ rules through the Popes.

Catech. ex decreto Concil. Trident. p. i. cap. x.

Eph. i. 22, 23.

'To Peter,' says St. Peter Chrysologus, 'does the Lord commend His sheep, when about to return to heaven, that he may feed them in His stead. . . . . He commends to him the sheep and the offspring of the sheep; for He, the foreseeing Pastor, already knew

Serm. vi. de Jubil. ob Gent. vocat. circa A.D. 450.

Hom. in Vig. SS. Pet. et Paul.[1]

the future fecundity of His flock.' 'First,' says St. Eucherius (A.D. 445), 'He commits the lambs to him, then the sheep, because He makes him not pastor only, but pastor of pastors. Peter therefore feeds lambs and sheep, feeds children and mothers, rules both subjects and prelates.' St. Nilus observes that the Lord, after consoling the penitent heart of Peter, 'constituted him the shepherd of the whole world' (ποιμένα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης καθίστησιν).

Lib. ii. Ep. 75. circa A.D. 430. Ed. Leon. Allat.

These offices are permanent.

It is self-evident that all these offices were not to cease with Peter, since they were not given for the sake of Peter, but for the sake of the Church, and for the work of the Church, and were still more needed for future generations than for the time when the other apostles were on earth. Numberless authorities might be produced to prove that such was the belief of the early ages; but it may suffice to quote two which distinctly state it. The first occurs in the address of the Presbyter Philip,

[1] Quoted from Sconce's *Testimony of Antiquity to the Supremacy of the Holy See*—a most useful book, published in Sydney, 1848, and sold by Messrs. Burns & Oates, of London. Besides authorities, it contains simple, clear, and honest reasoning. It is to be regretted that the Rev. J. Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, 3 vols. 8vo., Dolman, 1846, which gives so large and valuable a collection of early testimony to Catholic doctrine, has also reproduced certain propositions from a treatise censured by Bishop Milner as 'defective, ambiguous, suspicious, and erroneous.' See the Rev. W. H. Anderdon's letter in the *Weekly Register* of March 31st, 1866, republished by the *Dublin Review* in July 1866, p. 257, in reference to a reprint of the aforesaid treatise under the title of *The Catholic Eirenicon* (Hayes, London, 1865), 'from the edition of 1815.'

Legate of the Apostolic See of Rome, to the third great Œcumenical Council, held at Ephesus A.D. 431. There, in the heart of the East, without a dissentient voice among the bishops, he commences his confirmation of the condemnation of Nestorius (on the part of Pope St. Celestine) in the following terms:—

'No one doubts, nay it is known through all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the apostles, column of the faith, and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, and there was given to the same the power of loosing and of binding sins: who up to this time without intermission, and always, lives and exercises the office of a judge (*judicium exercet*) in his successors.' Hard. Act. Concil. T.I. col. 1478.

Anglicans profess to follow in all things the first centuries of the Church, and to accept the above-named Council of Ephesus. But, it may be asked, would the same words be received in the same way by the English convocation, if addressed to that assembly by a legate of Pope Pius IX.?

It was not many years later when the great St. Leo (in one of his sermons on the anniversary of his elevation to the Roman Pontificate), after speaking of our Lord Jesus Christ as the great High Priest still ruling in His Church, continued his discourse as follows:—

'Therefore, most dearly beloved, our festivity is not presumptuous, wherein, mindful of the divine favour, we do honour to the day on which we received the priesthood; inasmuch as we piously and truly confess that Christ fulfils Serm. v. cap. iv.

the work of our ministry in all things that we rightly perform; and not in ourselves, who without Him can do nothing, but in Himself, Who is our power, do we glory. Another reason for our solemnity is not only the Apostolic, but also the Episcopal dignity of the most blessed Peter, who ceases not to preside over his see, and maintains an unfailing fellowship with the eternal Priest. For that solidity, which, from the Rock Christ, he also, made a Rock, received (*de Petra Christo etiam ipse Petra factus accepit*), has transfused itself also to his heirs, and wheresoever any firmness is manifested, without doubt there appears the fortitude of the pastor. For if, in order to show forth their merits, it has been granted to nearly all the martyrs everywhere, because of their endurance of the sufferings they embraced, to assist those in danger, to drive away diseases, to expel unclean spirits, and to cure innumerable sicknesses; who will so unskilfully or enviously estimate the glory of blessed Peter, as to believe that there are any parts of the Church which are not ruled by his solicitude and strengthened by his power?'

De Trin. L. vi. c. 20.

The graphic words of St. Hilary of Poitiers are as applicable now in the person of Pope Pius IX. as they have been heretofore through his long line of predecessors, and as they will continue to be to the end:—'Blessed Simon, after his confession of the mystery, supporting the edifice of the Church and receiving the keys of the heavenly kingdom.'—'*Post sacramenti confessionem beatus Simon ædificationi Ecclesiæ subjacens et claves regni cœlestis accipiens.*'

The Primacy is a great grace.

I have but glanced at this vast and all-important subject, which lies at the very root of Christianity, and gives it an aspect under which a denial of the Pope's supremacy in the Church becomes visibly 'another gospel.' Nor have I

done more than glean, here and there, one authority among thousands in proof of my assertions. Whole volumes might be filled, and have been filled, with the arguments and testimony of centuries, in support of this fundamental article of Christian belief. But, unless God prepare men's hearts, and unless men co-operate with God's grace, the most convincing of proofs will be unavailing. It is humbling to reflect that prejudice can have so great a power to close the human heart against the reception of a Christian truth so strongly and clearly attested, and, at the same time, so consoling, strengthening, and encouraging; so analogous to all we know of God's mercy and of His dealings, and so abounding in His love for us;—as is that truth of His ever-present rule and care, not only invisibly from the realms above, but visibly, tangibly, here on earth, in the venerable person of His own representative. Like all the other manifestations of His overflowing goodness, it is too great for human littleness; men can hardly rise to its conception; and unless His grace gives larger and more generous powers of appreciation and of confiding love, they cannot comprehend the vast munificence of His condescension. O truly 'slow of heart' are we, like the disciples on the way to Emmaus, 'to believe in all things which the prophets have spoken!' Christ's resurrection was to them a thought too glorious, too full of joy, to be true. Christ's perpetual presence with us through His Vicar may be, to many, a doctrine which so realizes

St. Luke xxiv. 25.

to the full all their visions of a Christian Church, that they think the happiness too great for earth, and accuse of sordid ambition that very See of Peter, in which Christ Himself presides through a human delegate.

Visible and present testimony.

Nevertheless, not only sacred scripture and the holy fathers, not only venerable antiquity and all Christian history, proclaim this truth with the voices of ages that are past, and teach that out of the apostolical communion of Rome, no Church can be apostolic; but it is written with the finger of God in the passing events of the day and hour. Where else, save in the Roman Pontiff, is to be found the apostolic type at the present moment? Where else the image of God's tranquil power undisturbed by the rude confusions and wickedness of mankind? Patient, and meek, and tender, but strong with a superhuman strength. Forgiving, as Christ forgave; but testifying to truth and justice and everlasting right, as Christ also testified upon the cross. Here, in spirit and in letter, is beheld the apostolic pattern:—

2 Cor. vi. 3–10.

'Giving no offence to any man, that our ministry be not blamed: but in all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in tribulation, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in prisons, in seditions, in labours, in watchings, in fastings, in chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armour of justice on the right hand and on the left, by

honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true: as unknown, and yet known: as dying, and behold we live: as chastised, and not killed: as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing: as needy, yet enriching many: as having nothing, and possessing all things.' The quotation may be continued, for the apostolic voice now responds to all who, remaining separated, still long for unity,—'Our mouth is open to you, our heart is enlarged. You are not straitened in us: but in your own bowels you are straitened.' Ibid. 11, 12.

Let thoughtful men compare, at this very moment, the world-wide labours and zeal; the devotion and earnestness; the faith, charity, and unity; the spirit of self-sacrifice; the chastity and heroic virtue; the prevailing concord of bishops and priests among themselves, with Rome, and with the people; so apparent among Christians in communion with the Apostolic See;—let them compare these present facts, not with this or that individual instance which, from its nearness and its very singularity, assumes undue proportions, but with the general condition, and the usual religious standard of any other Christian body; and let them say whether the Divine presence and the Apostolic rule of life are to be discerned in any other. That which amongst others is exceptional, if found at all, is set before Roman Catholics as their ordinary rule. Many, no doubt, fall short; but many press on beyond it, and attain to heroic virtues not to be found elsewhere. Rome begins where

others end. The most advanced outside her, are but like tyros in her school of sanctity. Her very starting points for perfection are the evangelical counsels of continence, poverty, and obedience, virtues which she preaches on the housetops, and acknowledges as divine for all who are called to practise them. Whereas too commonly elsewhere, they must not be named unless in secret, and if practised at all it must be more or less by stealth. Far be it from me to withhold an earnest sympathy from all who anywhere may aim at them; far be it from me to make light of these or any other virtues wherever they may be found. I seek but to give them their perfection; to point out their true home, their natural birthplace, their congenial soil. To the established English Church they are exotic, foreign and unwelcomed by the mass. How many of her bishops are there who encourage the diffusion of these counsels of the Gospel, or who acknowledge them at all as such? Nay, to speak only of essential doctrine, her clergy are not agreed amongst themselves respecting many most fundamental truths of Christianity, such as our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist, the efficacy of Baptism, the existence of the Sacrament of Penance, and the like.

It is not hard to discern the one supernatural home on earth of all most true and most heroic in man's religious life. The only home of apostolic doctrine, and of apostolic virtues, is the Apostolic Church. Elsewhere, indeed, they may seem to be transplanted

and to flourish for a while, isolated and strange: elsewhere, too, may natural virtue be so highly cultivated as to seem, in human sight, to wear the aspect of divine; though not so in the eyes of God. But, at the best, such cases are the exception. In the Roman Catholic Church alone, is to be found the supernatural life of grace in that spontaneous and full development, which bespeaks its birthplace and its native air. It is there that, through its exuberance of growth; its full, vigorous, and prolific energy, recognised, welcomed, and familiar to all; its profusion of flower and prodigality of fruit; it reveals the divine fecundity of the soil, and gives evidence that its being and its strength are drawn from that exulting and abounding river, which gladdens the city and the vineyard of our God; which has its source in the pierced side and most precious wounds of Jesus, and flows on to us through the channel of the Apostolic chair of Peter.

Rome is the centre of unity.

God has given in charge to Peter the eternal interests of all mankind; and has constituted Peter's See the guardian of His gifts of grace. Rome alone dares claim this world-wide rule, and Rome alone possesses it. In her lives on, and ever will live on, the blessed rule of Peter. In her, through him, its head, the whole college of the Apostles is represented to us. Out of her communion no Church can be Apostolic. Christ Himself dwells in her, and He has established that imperishable dynasty as the everlasting basis of His everlasting Church. He has constituted

each succeeding Roman Pontiff the teacher of His faith; the centre of His Church's Unity; the ruler and the shepherd of His flock; on him alone has He conferred the divine right of delegating His jurisdiction throughout the universe, and of sending forth the messengers of whom it is written :—'*How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things!*'

Rom. x. 15.

The Church bears the image of her Lord.

This Apostolic mission is from Christ, and the model of it is His own mission from the Father. He, too, gives the Church her Unity, her Sanctity, her Catholicity. They are, all of them, the purchase of His most precious blood; the gifts of His most sacred Heart. They form the image and the expression of His own divine perfections, Who dwells Himself within her.

Apoc. v. 9, 10.

'*Redemisti nos, Deus, in sanguine tuo ex omni tribu, et lingua, et populo, et natione, et fecisti nos Deo nostro regnum.*'

II.

Quia non potest destrui, constat non esse divisum. Non enim dividitur unitas, nec scinditur; et ideo nec corruptelæ subditur, nec ætati.—*S. Ambros. de Fide*, lib. I. c. i. n. 11.

The Church's notes must be permanent and always visible.

THESE are the marks by which the Church of Christ may be known; these are her credentials. They are intimately connected with one another, and they are all of them essential; they cannot be divided, nor can any one of them be dispensed with. But if

they are notes they must be visible. When a person is described in a document it is by visible marks and features; it would be mere trifling to draw his picture in lineaments which could not always be recognised. If the visible Church is to endure till the end of all things, it follows that every one of her notes must endure also, permanent as herself and equally visible and characteristic as at the beginning. It would be more consistent to deny the necessity of a visible church and visible sacraments altogether, than whilst affirming it, at the same time to profess that any one of the essential notes of that Church can ever be lost to sight. Those notes remain for all generations, and form collectively a token and a signal marking the abode upon earth of that God 'Who will have all men to be saved.' The mission of the Church, the very end of her existence, is the salvation of the whole human race, not of any privileged class alone; and God cannot at any time allow her to be deprived of those marks by which she is always to be known through all the ages, to all who sincerely wish for salvation; not only to such as have leisure and learning to turn over the pages of the Fathers, and laboriously investigate the teachings of antiquity, but to the poor, the ignorant, the labouring, the masses of the human race.

1 Tim. ii. 4.

Each one of the four notes of Christ's Church is affirmed as a matter of faith by the Creed, and no man can reasonably trust his soul to any communion which does not visibly possess them all.

Attractiveness of the theory of the suspension of visible unity.

Consciences troubled by a sense of their separated position are naturally soothed and attracted by a theory which represents the existing divisions of Christendom in the light of a mere suspension of outward intercommunion, happening in chastisement for the sins of men, but involving no guilt of schism. There is a seeming humility in the teaching that separation ought therefore to be submitted to with resignation by individuals, though not without earnest prayers and endeavours for a general reconciliation. But this apparent angel of light is in reality a wolf in sheep's clothing, a delusive and seductive phantom, which will not stand the test of Ithuriel's bright spear of truth,—

Paradise Lost, iv. 811.

> 'for no falsehood can endure
> Touch of celestial temper, but returns
> Of force to its own likeness.'

Divine test of truth.

The Apostle 'whom Jesus loved,' has warned us against false spirits, and taught us how to detect them :—

I. St. John iv. 1, 2, 3.

'Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. By this is the spirit of God known. Every spirit, which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit that dissolveth Jesus,[1] is not of God: and this is Antichrist, of whom you have heard that he cometh, and he is now already in the world.'

---

[1] Ancient codices quoted by Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 32, read:—ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν; the Vulgate has:—*solvit Jesum.*—Note in Prof. Ornsby's edition of Card. Mai's Greek Testament. Dublin, 1860.

The meaning is the same in the Oxford Greek, which has:—ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα.

The test applied.

The Church is at once the fruit, and the application, and the continuance on earth, of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Holy Scripture declares it to be, 'His body, and the fulness of Him, who is filled all in all.' Whatever doctrine, then, dissolves the Church, dissolves Christ's presence upon earth. Whatever doctrine teaches that any one of the visible notes of the Church has failed, so far tends to deny that Christ is still with us in the Church.

Eph. i. 23.

The theory tends to dissolve the Church's notes: her Unity;

Now, the theory in question asserts that the Church, through the sins of her members, has forfeited the gift of visible unity. This would resemble the judgment which fell upon the proud sons of men whose language was confounded at Babel. They were building a tower of pride to reach the heavens, and God at once frustrated their design by depriving them of outward unity. This one curse sufficed. We are not told that they were less one inwardly, less united in their evil hearts than before, but their speech was rendered diverse; they were scattered into all lands; they lost their outward unity, and they were impotent to build. God's Church is God's own tower, by which He bids the humble of heart ascend to highest heaven. Can it be true that He has turned her into Babylon in anger at her children's sin, when it was sin she was sent to cure?

Her Sanctity; The infliction of so severe a judgment would seem to imply an amount of wickedness incompatible with the Church's attribute of sanctity. Although her pale upon earth comprises sinners as well as saints, yet if sin can have so far prevailed within her as to have led to the suspension of her outward unity, it must also have obscured her visible note of holiness.

Her Catholicity; If the Church's outward unity were thus suspended, and her inward energies crippled by prevailing sin, she could scarcely maintain her Catholicity throughout the regions of the earth, and certainly she would no longer be Catholic as to time. She would be a different Church from that of the early ages; nor would they recognise her in her state of outward division and inward falling off.

Her Apostolicity. The Church's mission is from Christ and from the Holy Spirit, whose abiding presence Christ has promised shall be for ever with her,—'the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive.' Were it even possible that this blessed Spirit of Holiness could continue with the Church after her holiness was obscured by sin, yet His teaching would no longer be discernible amidst the disagreement of division. In fact, the maintainers of the theory of suspended unity hold that the infallible voice of the Church is suspended likewise, and that men must now seek it as best they can by ascertaining what it was that she taught at the time when she was visibly and wholly one. Yet they do not point to any authority which can declare or explain that teaching with divine certitude. So

St. John xiv. 16, 17.

that, according to this doctrine, the Church's mission as the infallible teacher of the nations is in abeyance also, and her note of Apostolicity has become as invisible as her other notes.

Thus does the aforesaid theory tend directly to dissolve the Church, Christ's body; it tends to a denial of the abiding constancy of the Fruit of the Incarnation amongst us in its fulness; it would rob us of our Emmanuel, our 'God with us,' of 'Christ come in the flesh.'—This, St. John warns us, is the mark of Antichrist.

Maintainers of this doctrine.

Yet, as before observed, the same theory is so calculated to lull conscientious doubts regarding the safety of the Anglican position, that men who would abhor its consequences if perceived by them, have been beguiled into its acceptance and defence. Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon' is based upon it, and it is almost dogmatically put forth in the following extracts from a work by the Anglican Bishop of Brechin, Dr. Forbes.

The theory stated. Explanation of the Nicene Creed, by A. H. Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. pp. 274-7, 2nd edit. London, Parker, 1866.

After stating that unity is an 'attribute of the church,' and 'very clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures;' and asserting that 'the one truth requires one vehicle of its tradition, the society which was visibly to bear the image of the one Christ on earth,'—Dr. Forbes endeavours to show how real though unseen unity may still exist, beneath the divisions we behold.

'Unity,' he says, 'may be divided into objective and subjective. Objective unity is that inwrought by our Head, Jesus

Himself, through union with Himself. It is wrought on His side, by the communication of the 'one Spirit,' and by the Sacraments, making us all one body in Him. It requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which He gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church. Subjective unity is unity of will, and intercommunion with one another. Subjective unity may be suspended, while objective unity is maintained. Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity is maintained, for the blessed Meletius is a saint. Subjective unity was suspended in the quarrels between the British and Western Churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of St. Aidan or St. Cuthbert. Subjective unity was suspended during the struggles of the antipopes, yet no one considers the followers of Peter de Luna as either heretics or schismatics. And this must also apply to the mighty dissension between the East and the West, and between ourselves and the rest of Christendom. It is deeply to be deplored that the state of the Church is as it is; but let us hope that the evil is not so great as it seems, and that there is a fund of unity, if men only understood each other; that the fissures are only surface ones; that the disorder is functional, not organic.'

Desire for better understanding.

Doubtless a better understanding would remove many hindrances to re-union. But it is mere self-delusion to conceal the fact that the divisions extend far below the surface. They have to do with points of dogma; with truths revealed by God to man, which admit indeed of explanation, but not of compromise. Still, 'if men only understood each other,' much more of common ground would be discovered than they are now aware of.

It follows then, as a necessary consequence, that every man should do what he can to understand, and to make himself understood; that no one should shrink from listening to, or from giving, full and patient explanation; that no one should rest on statements which have no foundation in fact, or persist in them when proved to be false; that none should dwell on hearsay rumours and idle tales with which our common enemy seeks to beguile men from the truth; it follows, too, that no opportunity for fair discussion, in a spirit of charity, should be withheld or avoided; that no consequences should be shrunk from, which God's truth may involve; that we all, in a word, should be true, generous, and loving, candid, open-hearted, simple, honest, and loyal, to God, to one another, and to ourselves. How far each one is so, is a question for each one to ask himself. Would to God we all made it our business to understand and to love each other better!

Dr. Forbes's examination of the subject.

Dr. Forbes returns to the subject. At p. 285 he sketches the present divided state of Christendom, and asks,—'What are we to say with regard to it? how are we to justify it?' He rejects the doctrine that any single one of the various Christian bodies, whether Greek, Anglican, Roman Catholic, or any other, can be exclusively the one Church:—

Pp. 286–7.

'What is this,' he says, 'but the spirit of Donatism? Can this really satisfy the enlightened conscience of the Chris-

tian? How, on this ground, shall we account for the evident good that exists beyond our own system? Shall the Roman Catholic gainsay the grace which has been poured out on the Greek Obedience, so that nations of heathens or of heretics have since the schism been gathered into the faith in Christ? Shall the Anglican believe, that the merits of Carlo Borromeo, the most perfect type of the Christian bishop which the world ever saw, are as the evidence of grace in a man accidentally better than his system? Shall either Greek or Roman speak of the devout Ken, or George Herbert, or Launcelot Andrewes, as devils' blinds to keep men by a simulated disguise of goodness from what they term the true Church? Nay, shall men undervalue the unsacramental grace of those, who like Spener and Gerhard have adorned systems, which, in their logical consequences, and generally in their practical results, have led to the most miserable consequences?'

P. 287. He equally rejects indifferentism, and the theory of an invisible Church, as 'incompatible with a real belief in the Incarnation of the Word, 'for,' he observes, 'that Word has been made manifest, has become visible, and therefore must energize in some definite visible body.' He adds: 'There are also distinct texts in Scripture which attach salvation to belonging to the One Body of Christ. There are certain outward conditions, such as Baptism, the Eucharist, common worship, and the like, which necessarily imply some visible body.'

Pp. 288–91. He then proceeds:—

Dr. Forbes's explanation.

'The truth then must be somewhere between these two theories. On the one hand, we must avoid Donatism; on the other, Latitudinarianism. Holy Scripture sets forth

what Christians, as individuals, or collectively as the living Body of Christ, ought to be; but it does not say what degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel. The Church and her children in her were purchased by the blood of God, that they should be holy, the temple of the Holy Ghost, full of love and peace and all other fruits of the Spirit. It was said of individuals, "By this shall men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another;" as much as it was said of the whole Church, "That they may be one as We are." It was said of every Priest, "The lips of the Priest should keep knowledge," as much as it was said of the whole Church, "Thy teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more." Our Lord has promised, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" yet surely as much by the Spirit of Holiness, as by wisdom and teaching. Since then our Lord's promise was fulfilled in that dreary and hateful tenth century, when it was said that although our Lord was in the boat, men were afraid to wake Him up, but rather wished that He might never awake to judge them; so may it be fulfilled now, although the fulness of His Presence may be abated through our divisions and want of love. We bear separate witness still to the One Faith which He gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds; we all look to Him, as truly present in His Sacraments, truly giving His own Body and Blood; we all hold to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, teaching those same truths which they taught, and holding sacred the descent from them. We are one Body, through the one Spirit, and all partaking of the One Body of Christ, all holding to the One Head. The Body is mangled, but, we believe, not severed, through loss of intercommunion. We are one, we trust, in One, although in some, even grave things, not at one with one another. If the Gospel had its full course, every priest should be holy, and "all the children" of the Church "taught by God." Our Lord has promised, "I am with you alway, even to the end of

the world;" but He has not promised to be always present in the same degree or the same way. He is not with us as He was with the Apostles, in that they were "full of the Holy Ghost," and they spake as "moved by the Holy Ghost," so that what they spake were the words of God, and have been, ever since, a fountain of truth to the Church of Christ, such as no words, since spoken through men, are or can be. He has been with the Church, in different degrees, since, according to her faithfulness. His Presence was lessened, surely, when He gave over whole Churches to the Moslem apostasy. His Presence was lessened when He had given a nation, once the glory of the Church, to set up the goddess of Reason. Everywhere He is present, in every office exercised in His name: He regenerates, He confirms, He absolves, He consecrates, He ordains, He preserves the truth, He teaches those who will receive it.'

I omit a paragraph on invincible ignorance, after which Dr. Forbes proceeds:—

P. 290. 'It is best too to acknowledge our disjointed and unhappy condition, rather than to shape the Gospel into a theory that suits us. We had better acknowledge, that for the sins of Christendom subjective unity is suspended, and that while God has done great things for us, we have not co-operated therewith.'

He exhorts men to strive and pray for unity, and adds:—

P. 291. 'One effect of our unhappy divisions is, that we cannot meet, even to heal them. Until we long more for unity, we cannot take even the first visible steps towards it, and union in heart must precede union in visible act. As God's Holy Spirit fills the river of God, it will, in all its several channels, overflow its banks, until they meet in one vast sea of the knowledge and of the love of God.'

The river of God gladdens many nations, whose several hierarchies form many channels. But these hierarchies have all one visible head and centre, and thus the channels, though diverse, are not divided. Their life-bestowing waters flow on through the paradise of the one fold in many courses and directions, but they remain still visibly united with each other through their central union in the one spring which pours forth its abundant waves from the Apostolic throne; from the sacred hill of Sion, the holy mountain in which God dwells. These are the waters of 'the rivers of Juda, and their fountain comes forth of the house of the Lord,' which is established and built up by Himself on Peter. God owns not Churches of man's making.—'My people,' says the Lord, 'have done two evils. They have forsaken me, the fountain of living water, and have digged to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.'

One Church in many nations.

Joel iii. 18.

Jerem. ii. 13.

It is true that 'the Spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world:' that 'the Spirit breatheth where he will; and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh and whither he goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' I have already spoken of the secret dealings of God with individuals. They are unfathomable. God has reserved them to Himself, and we cannot deduce from them any general rule of conduct. If we search into them, we seem to meet with the reply which Christ gave to His Apostle:—'What is it to thee? Follow thou me.' It is for each one to act up to his

Wisdom i. 7.

St. John iii. 8.

See p. 17, &c.

The mysteries of Divine grace.

St. John xxi. 22.

own knowledge, and to take heed to follow closely the light and grace vouchsafed to himself in particular. But of this we are sure;—that the light and grace bestowed on those outside the fold, is intended by God to lead them onwards to full and outward communion with that one Church which is the one only visible temple of His presence; the one only body of men wherein His Spirit everlastingly abides; and, that, if they wilfully frustrate this divine purpose, they will be called upon to give account. Even Sacraments of the Church may be found outside her pale, wherever there is a true priesthood; but they turn to death instead of life, to all who culpably remain in a state of schism.

Exclusiveness of the one Church.

The one Spirit of Christ animates the one Body of Christ, whose unity excludes all other bodies. It has many members, and its life-blood flows through many veins and arteries; but they have all one only centre; one heart which feeds them, and one circumference which limits them. No body of Christians can be external to this, and, at the same time, one with it. No Churches can be Christ's which are not visibly a portion of it. The sap which circulates through the vine gives life to that tree alone. It cannot nourish any other which is independent in its growth. The one living God cannot dwell in any Church but one: but that one Church is extended over the whole world, and God would have all men to unite themselves to her communion, and become partakers of her divine life.

It is in this sense that the Roman Catholic Church, though universal, is at the same time exclusive, and necessarily so. It is not her own doing, it is God's. Nor could she otherwise fulfil her office. Every one who believes in one visible Church and one definite revelation, and the necessity of faith in that revelation, must also admit the existence of certain limits. It is simply a question of degree; he must acknowledge a line of demarcation somewhere. Omnipotence itself cannot divide a unit, and still leave it one; nor elicit more than one truth out of innumerable discordant opinions. If the Church is one, by that very fact she becomes exclusive. If God has revealed the truth on any given point, by that very fact it becomes the only truth, as far as that point extends. Therefore, so far from exclusiveness affording any ground for objection, it is an essential characteristic of the one true Church. I do not say it is the only characteristic, or by any means a conclusive one, for a false system may assert it; but I say it is a necessary characteristic, for God's system can never admit a rival.

Solution of the seeming paradox.

Here we find one of the many apparent paradoxes of Christianity, and, like all others, its solution is redundant in wisdom and beauty. There is no teaching which, whilst it strictly maintains the exclusive unity of God's religion and God's church, will be found, at the same time, one-half so free, so large, or so liberal, regarding the boundless, overflowing, and universal mercies of the self-same God, as the teaching of the church of Peter, out-

side whose fold there is no salvation. There is no other teaching which can 'justify the ways of God to man,' maintaining to the full the claims of His truth and justice, and at the same time magnifying and extolling His sovereign prerogative of loving-kindness. Inside Christ's fold there are wolves who have no inward union with the flock; and, outside it, He may have sheep who belong to it in heart, and would run to its visible protection if they did but know it. How many such souls may there not be in the Russian and other Greek communions? And also amongst other separated communities? Yet, of late, in our own countries, the truth has been so loudly proclaimed, that there is too much reason to fear it is often rejected or put off.

The Catholic Doctrine.

The doctrine of the Roman Church is the only consistent or satisfactory explanation of the difficulty expressed by Dr. Forbes, respecting goodness found outside her, and it is a true and sufficient explanation. The following extracts will not be out of place from the pages of one more competent than I am to speak on such a subject. In his 'Lectures on Anglican Difficulties,'[1] Dr. Newman says:—

'Grace is given for the merits of Christ all over the earth; there is no corner, even of Paganism, where it is not present—present in each heart of man, in real sufficiency for his ultimate salvation. Not that the grace presented to each is such, as at once to bring him to heaven; but it is sufficient for a beginning. It is sufficient to enable him

[1] Burns & Co. 1850. Lect. III. pp. 70–74.

to plead for other grace, and that second grace is such as to impetrate a third grace; and thus the soul is led on from grace to grace, and from strength to strength, till at length it is, so to say, in very sight of heaven, if the gift of perseverance does but complete the work. Now, here observe, it is not certain that a soul which has the first grace will have the second; the grant of the second depends on its use of the first. Again, it may have the first and second, and yet not the third; or from the first on to the nineteenth, and not the twentieth. We mount up by steps towards God, and, alas! it is possible that a soul may be courageous and bear up for nineteen steps, and stop and faint at the twentieth. Nay, further than this—a soul may go forward till it arrives at the very grace of contrition, a contrition so loving, so sin-renouncing, as to bring it at once into a state of reconciliation, and clothe it in the vestment of justice; and yet it may yield to the further trials which beset it and fall away.

'Now, all this may take place even outside the Church, and consider what at once follows from it. This follows in the first place, that men there may be, not Catholics, really obeying God and rewarded by Him, nay in His favour, with their sins forgiven and with a secret union with that heavenly kingdom to which they do not visibly belong, who are, through their subsequent failure, never to reach it. There may be those who are increasing in grace and knowledge, and approaching nearer to the Catholic Church every year, who are not in the Church and never will be. The highest gifts and graces are compatible with ultimate reprobation. As regards, then, the evidences of sanctity in members of the National Establishment, on which you insist, Catholics are not called on to deny them. We think such instances are few, nor so eminent as you are accustomed to fancy; but we do not wish to deny, nor have any difficulty in admitting, such facts as you have to adduce, whatever they be. We do not think it necessary to carp at every instance of supernatural excellence

among Protestants when it comes before us, or to explain it away; all we know is, that the grace given them is intended ultimately to bring them into the Church, and if it does not tend to do so, it will not ultimately profit them; but we as little deny its presence in their souls as Protestants themselves, and as the fact is no perplexity to us, it is no triumph to them.

'And secondly, in like manner, whatever be the comfort or the strength attendant upon the use of the national ordinances in the case of this or that person, a Catholic may admit it without scruple, for it is no evidence to him in behalf of those ordinances themselves.'

He then explains the distinction between grace conveyed through a sacrament; as to an infant through baptism; and without a sacrament, through 'the inward energetic act of the recipient.' The Council of Trent refers to the case where 'contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God, before the Sacrament of Penance is actually received.' Thus, this disposition of the heart obtains the effects of that Sacrament without its actual reception, although, as the same Council states, it 'is as necessary for those who have fallen after baptism, as baptism itself for the unregenerate.' The Council teaches, indeed, that, 'the said reconciliation is not to be ascribed to that contrition, independently of the desire of the sacrament which is included therein.' Still, if in such a case God gives the grace without the sacrament, He may do so also in other cases where men seek Him in good faith; especially, in ordinances where they think He is, though in truth He is not there. He visits them, in reward of their loving

Session xiv. ch. 4.

Ibid. ch. 2.

search of Him, but it is not by the channel wherein they seek Him, and through which they think they find Him. Dr. Newman proceeds:—

'Let me grant to you then, that the reception of your ordinances brings peace and joy to the soul; that it permanently influences or changes the character of the recipient. Let me grant, on the other hand, that their profanation, when men have been taught to believe in them, and in profaning are guilty of contempt of that God to whom they ascribe them, is attended by judgments; this properly shows nothing more than that, by a general law, lying, deceit, presumption, or hypocrisy are punished, and prayer, faith, contrition, rewarded. There is nothing to show that the effects would not have been precisely the same under the same inward dispositions, though another ordinance, a love-feast or a washing the feet, with no pretence to the name of a Sacrament, had in good faith been adopted. And it is obvious to any one that, for a member of the Establishment to bring himself to confession, especially some years back, required dispositions of a very special character, a special contrition and a special desire of the Sacrament, which, as far as we may judge by outward signs, were a special effect of grace, and would fittingly receive from God's bounty a special reward, some further and higher grace, or even remission of sins. And again, when a member of the Establishment, surrounded by those who scoffed at the doctrine, accepted God's word that He would make bread His Body, and honoured Him by accepting it, is it wonderful, is it not suitable to God's mercy, if He reward such a special faith with a *quasi* sacramental grace, though he ignorantly offered to a material substance that adoration which He intended to pay to the present, but invisible, Lamb of God?'

Individual cases afford no criterion.

Thus, Rome requires no one to brand as 'devils' blinds' either Ken, or Herbert, or Andrewes, or any

other. Nor yet men of another school, such as Henry Martin, Legh Richmond, Wilberforce, and, in our own day, the pious and meek Archbishop Sumner, whose goodness was notorious. Yet the same Dr. Sumner, on being consulted officially as Archbishop of Canterbury (after the Gorham decision), told the believers in baptismal regeneration to continue to teach that doctrine as heretofore; only to allow to those who differed, an equal freedom to deny it; just as the established English Church does now.

Presbyterians.

I am sure that, without referring to the Lutheran Gerhard, or to Spener the father of Protestant German pietism, Dr. Forbes could have produced many striking instances of religious fervour from amongst the sectarians of his own land. There, in the open air on a summer Sunday, the traveller still may find the Gaelic preacher, and his crowds of listeners; children of those old Covenanters, who, firm to the death in their resistance to 'Antichrist and Prelacy,' met in multitudes to worship God on the barren mountain side. Of them came the young MacKail, who, according to Sir Walter Scott, displayed a martyr's courage under cruel torture, and welcomed the death to which, in the same cause, he was condemned, with the exclamation:—'I shall speak no more with earthly creatures, but shall enjoy the aspect of the ineffable Creator Himself. Farewell father, mother, friends—welcome glory—welcome eternal life—and welcome, death!'

Tales of a Grandfather.

Wesley and Whitefield.

What shall be said of John Wesley, with his boundless alms, his rice or biscuit food, his bed on

the floor, his constant toil and preaching, proving the sincerity of his prayer:—'Lord let me not live useless'? There is Whitefield, again, with his early ardour in visiting hospitals and prisons, his spirit-moving sermons and his thousands of weeping hearers.

Personal responsibility.

In spite of such phenomena, the question for each one remains the same. We have not to answer for others, excepting so far as we can influence them. We *have* to answer for ourselves.—'What must *I* do, that I may be saved?'—Which is the Gospel of Christ?—Where is the faith once delivered to the Saints? For there is but one Gospel and one faith. If a very angel from heaven preach another, 'let him be anathema!' Thus are we warned by the Holy Ghost.

Quakers.

Mrs. Fry.

Cases of extraordinary goodness may be found even amongst the unbaptized. There is a well-known instance in the life-long, ceaseless, labours of the Quakeress, Mrs. Fry. Born to wealth, educated in accomplishments, at an early age she found herself, in mind, she tells us, as 'a vessel without a pilot on a stormy sea,' and she turned to scepticism; but she was brought back to religious convictions and a corresponding life by an American fellow-Quaker; and, even at the age of eighteen, she opened a school for eighty poor children, within her father's house. After her marriage, the accounts of misery in the prisons reached her ears; she fearlessly entered the dungeons of Newgate, and found herself amongst 160 female prisoners and a number of children, in a den of depravity and

disorder. Her entrance raised a tumult, but her noble, loving mien and her gentle words controlled it. She returned a second time with her Bible, and pointed to it as the ground of her mission. She read to that wild assembly the 20th chapter of St. Matthew; how Christ calls all into His vineyard, how the last shall be first, how He came to give His life for all, and how He had compassion on the blind. She wearied not in her work, and at length the dungeon changed its aspect, and its inmates voluntarily undertook, at her suggestion, the observance of a formal rule as if their dwelling had been a convent. Thus commenced her life, and, ere it ended, it might be said of her that she had done for the moral character of prisons what Howard had previously effected for their material improvement. Her efforts were not confined to England; they extended to France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and a part of Germany. The king of Prussia showed her especial honour. All the while, she was earnestly practising her religious tenets, and encouraging others in them. But up to the time of her death, she assisted and consoled the poor and distressed of all religions, and in her diary it was found, recorded by herself—'I never feel so happy as when I have helped another by the way, or relieved the sufferings of some fellow-creature in affliction.' She was honoured and beloved by high and low, and 'her children rose up and called her blessed.'

Had not such a one the baptism of will? It may be so. It is God's secret. But we know that God is just,

and very merciful. Not even a cup of cold water, if given for the love of Him, shall lose its sure reward.

God forbid we should ever decry goodness. God forbid we should ever shrink from extolling it as from Him, wherever it may be found. But heap together all the goodness, all the virtues, all the sanctity that exists, or ever has existed, throughout the globe, apart from the Church of Peter; and, not at its utmost, could the accumulation be compared with the heroic, eagle-soaring holiness, and transcendent unearthliness of life, which reveal the presence of the living God in the person of any single one of those superhuman miracles of His grace, who are to be found in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, and whom she recognises as His Saints, shining in glory like the glittering stars of heaven.

Greek missions.

My present purpose does not require me to analyse the accuracy of the statements of Dr. Forbes and others, respecting conversions effected by the Greek Church. I need not now pause to prove how mistaken is the idea entertained by some, that, in past ages, Russia received her Christianity from Constantinople at a period when that Church was severed from the Roman communion; and that Bulgaria owed it to the few schismatic priests who (together with other religionists mingled with them) so perplexed the Prince Bogoris as to induce him to address himself to Pope St. Nicholas I. Nor need I inquire whether more recent missionary efforts have surpassed the

limits of Russian influence, even if they have extended beyond the bounds of her territory. Nor, again, how far their success may be due to the tempting Russian gold, or the formidable Russian knout,—to hopes or to fears for which Russia, not heaven, supplies the motive. We need not go beyond Catholic Poland to be convinced of her missionary ardour, or to learn the means which she hesitates not to employ in the propagation of a faith which is the handmaid to her politics. All this is beside the question; for though sterility is a clear mark of error (since God's spirit can never be inactive), yet fecundity is no sure mark of truth. On the contrary, heresy, sectarianism, and every other form of error, is usually more or less prolific. If, in any case, they can be pointed to as sterile, it forms the exception, not the rule. Mahometanism of old spread itself, like a withering blight, over the fairest regions of the East; and, in our own day, infidelity and irreligion have undermined, and, alas! still are undermining, the faith of thousands, in the most civilised countries of the West. Again,—the diffusion, the vitality, and the earnestness of the ancient heresies, and their widespread missionary work amongst the heathen, present an aspect perfectly astonishing, and form a mystery in our contemplation of God's dealings, which is unfathomable to the human understanding.

Nestorians. Decline and Fall, &c. chap. xlvii.

According to Gibbon, the Nestorian heretics successfully preached Christianity 'to the Bactrians,

the Huns, the Persians, the Indians, the Persarmenians, the Medes, and the Elamites: the barbaric churches, from the Gulf of Persia to the Caspian sea, were almost infinite; and their recent faith was conspicuous in the number and sanctity of their monks and martyrs. The pepper coast of Malabar and the isles of the ocean, Socotora and Ceylon, were peopled with an increasing number of Christians.' He says that, in a subsequent age, the Nestorian missionaries 'pursued without fear the steps of the roving Tartar, and insinuated themselves into the camps of the valleys of Imaus and the banks of the Selinga;' that they 'entered China by the port of Canton and the northern residence of Sigan;' and that 'under the reign of the caliphs, the Nestorian Church was diffused from China to Jerusalem and Cyprus; and their numbers, with those of the Jacobites, were computed to surpass the Greek and Latin communions' (at least in those countries).

Thomassin says that Marco Polo found many Nestorian Churches in Tartary, in the Mogul country, and in China and its capital, under a Patriarch whose residence was at Mosul on the Tigris, from whence, like another Pope, says the above-named author, he sent forth Archbishops and Bishops throughout the province of Babylon, and the whole of the Indies. He bore the title of the '*Catholicus*.' The Franciscan missionaries in the same (thirteenth) century, and at the commencement of the fourteenth, (as quoted by Fleury,) state, that they found the Nestorians still

Discip. de l'Église, P. I. L. i. ch. xxiv. 7.

Ibid. Livres lxxxiv. 19, and xc. 46.

possessing a bishopric, and inhabiting fifteen towns, in China; degraded in morals and religion, but so powerful that they would not permit any Christian of a different rite to have an oratory there, however small, or to preach any other doctrine than their own; and the reason given for this is, that none of the Apostles or of their disciples ever came into those countries. In like manner, when the Portuguese began their expeditions to the East Indies, all the Bishops and Christians whom they found there were Nestorians, under the Babylonian Patriarch at Mosul.

Jacobites.

This primacy was however contested by the Jacobite Bishop in the same city, who ruled that rival heresy under the title of *Maphrian*, in subordination to the Patriarch of Antioch. This revival of Eutychianism spread itself over the whole of Asia and Africa, under the empire of the Saracens; and was said to have infected more than forty kingdoms with its pestilential tenets. It derived its appellation from the Syrian monk, Jacobus Baradæus, by whose labours 'was revived, and united, and perpetuated the expiring faction' of the Monophysites. They had been befriended by the Emperor Anastasius, and their rule of faith had been defined by Severus, Patriarch of Antioch. But the succeeding Emperor re-established Catholicity in the East, and Severus fled into Egypt. Fifty-four bishops of his heresy were swept from their thrones, and eight hundred ecclesiastics cast into prison. It was from these prisoners, says the historian, that Jacobus Baradæus

Thomassin Discip. de l'Église, P. I. L. i. ch. xxiv. 2.

Gibbon, ch. xlvii.

'received the powers of Bishop of Edessa and Apostle of the East, and the ordination of fourscore thousand bishops, priests, and deacons, is derived from the same inexhaustible source.' 'The successors of Severus, while they lurked in convents or villages, while they sheltered their proscribed heads in the caverns of hermits or the tents of the Saracens, still asserted, as they now assert, their indefeasible right to the title, the rank, and the prerogatives of Patriarch of Antioch.' He adds that 'during five annual lents both the clergy and laity' of the Jacobites 'abstain not only from flesh and eggs, but even from the taste of wine, of oil, and of fish.'

Probation of the faithful.

All these things seem to be permitted as a scourge, and as a searching trial of men's hearts—δοκιμασία πιστῶν—as St. Epiphanius says of the Arian troubles. From the very commencement of the world, the elect have been tested by counterfeit imitations of God's truth; and so must it continue to the end, even till 'that wicked one shall be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of His mouth; and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: him, whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: that all may be judged who have not believed the truth, but have consented to iniquity.'

Advers. Hæres. lxix. n. 12.

II. Thessalon. ii. 8-11.

Arianism.

How marvellous was the spread of the Arian heresy! For more than 300 years (nearly the age of modern Protestantism) it devastated the faith of thousands, and it has been resuscitated in modern Socinianism.

The Baptism of Valens.

The Imperial Russians, Olga and Wladimir I., received their baptism from Constantinople when that church was in communion with Rome; for the schism of Photius had, for the time, been healed. In the year 368, the Latin Emperor Valens was baptised, also, at Constantinople; but it was by Eudoxius, the Arch-Arian Bishop of that See, who, at the same time, imposed on the Emperor a solemn oath, never to renounce the Arian impiety, and to drive away all its opponents. He kept the vow too well.

Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. t. v. p. 89.

The Goths.

Through Valens the heresy was conveyed to the Goths. It spread through their various tribes, and envenomed them with so fierce a hatred of Catholics, that their cruelties rivalled those of the ancient Pagans. It was in one of these persecutions (A.D. 586) that the martyr St. Hermenegild, who had been converted from Arianism by his wife, met his death at the command of his own father, Leovigild, in consequence of his refusal to receive communion from an Arian prelate. Yet in some respects the virtues of these Arian Goths put to shame the evil lives of too many Catholics, whose immorality, Salvian tells us, was such as to shock the very barbarians; and he asks of what use it is for such persons to reproach the Goths and Vandals with heresy,

De Gub. Dei, lib. vii.

whilst they themselves are 'living in heretical depravity.' Dr. Newman says that 'the barbarians were chaste, temperate, just, and devout; the Visigoth Theodoric repaired every morning with his domestic officers to his chapel, where service was performed by the Arian priests.' He adds that they are recorded to have sustained defeat upon a Sunday, owing to their being engaged in religious worship instead of preparing for battle; and that 'many of their princes were men of great ability, as the two Theodorics, Euric, and Leovigild.'

Essay on Development, p. 273.

The instrument employed by Valens for the original perversion of the Gothic tribes, was their own Bishop Ulphilas, a man of extraordinary gifts, and who had seemed a very Saint. He had exposed himself to an infinity of dangers for the conversion of these peoples; he had extended religion, civilized manners, invented letters, and translated the whole of the Bible into their language, except portions treating of war, which he omitted for fear lest the recital of the Jewish victories should inflame still more the too ready ardour of the Goths for the battle-field. Their veneration for him was unbounded; and when he yielded to the seductions of Valens and the Arian Bishops, he found it easy to persuade his flock that the points at issue were not essential. The heretical pest was spread from tribe to tribe, from multitudes to multitudes; and when they established themselves in the South of Europe and in Africa, their religion was a Christianity which denied

Ulphilas. Tillemont, Hist. Eccl. vi. p. 605, &c.

the divinity of Christ, and sought to exterminate Catholicity. 'Behold,' observes Tillemont, 'how a single man drew down to hell this infinite number of the northerns. . . . It is a fearful example of that which the Truth Himself proclaims: that if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit. And St. Augustin had good reason so often to admonish both pastors and people, of the necessity of attaching themselves to Jesus Christ alone, and to the truth of His Gospel, and not to any man, whatever he may be, or however gifted by nature and by grace, since every man is a liar, prone to error, and even to fall utterly, like Ulphilas.'

Other heresies.

I might further cite the instances of Gnosticism and Novatianism in their day, as well as those of other heresies. In fact, after the most that can be made of Greeks and Russians, their efforts fall short of the usual activity of error, and it may be questioned whether their ardour equals that of the acknowledged heretics above named.

The early ages.

There are those who dream of the early centuries of the Church as of a golden age, when, if Christians had more to endure through outward fightings, they were less embarrassed by inward fears. Such persons picture to themselves the presence of Christ as being then more visible and tangible, and the unity of His Church as more apparent and undeniable. But these are pure imaginings. Those early days were full of perplexities and troubles; schisms and heresies were on every side; and perhaps there is no

period in Ecclesiastical history, in which the one only Church stands out more visibly and evidently than now.

Fourth century.

I have already quoted Dr. Newman at some length on a point of doctrine. His testimony will not be considered less valuable respecting the history of those ancient times, which, it is well known, have formed a subject of his special studies. In his 'Essay on Development', he thus describes the state of the Church in the fourth century. I give his words with a slight abridgment:—'Few indeed,' he tells us, 'were the districts in the *orbis terrarum*, which did not then, as in the Ante-Nicene era, present a number of creeds and communions from which to select. In Egypt, in the earlier part of the fourth century, the Meletian schism numbered one-third as many Bishops as were contained in the whole Patriarchate.' (These were the followers of the Meletius condemned at the Council of Nice—a totally different person from St. Meletius of Antioch, who is referred to by Dr. Forbes.) 'In Africa, towards the end of the same century, the Donatists had 400 Bishops, the Catholics 466. Priscillianism was spread over Spain, and its author honoured as a martyr. At Rome and in Italy were found Manichees, Marcionites, and Origenists. Rome was moreover the seat of a Novatian, a Donatist, and a Luciferian bishop, in addition to the true Roman pontiff. The Luciferians were sprinkled over Christendom, from Spain to Palestine, and from Treves to Lybia. When St. Gregory Nazianzen

Pages 243–245.

began to preach at Constantinople, the Arians were in possession of its hundred churches, and they had the populace in their favour. The Novatians, too, abounded there, and the Sabbatians had a church, where they prayed at the tomb of their founder. Apollinarians, Eunomians, and Semi-Arians, were there in great numbers. In the neighbouring provinces, popular feeling was with the Semi-Arian Bishops, who had possession of the coast of the Hellespont and Bithynia; and were found in Phrygia, Isauria, and the neighbouring parts of Asia Minor. Phrygia was the head-quarters of the Montanists, and was overrun by the Messalians, who had advanced thus far from Mesopotamia, spreading through Syria, Lycaonia, Pamphylia, and Cappadocia in their way. In the lesser Armenia the same heretics had penetrated into the monasteries. Phrygia too, and Paphlagonia, were the seat of the Novatians, who besides were in force at Nicæa and Nicomedia, were found in Alexandria, Africa, and Spain, and had a bishop even in Scythia. The whole tract of country from the Hellespont to Cilicia had nearly lapsed into Eunomianism, and the tract from Cilicia as far as Phœnicia to Apollinarianism. The disorders of the Church of Antioch are well known: an Arian succession, two orthodox claimants, and a bishop of the Apollinarians. Palestine abounded in Origenists, if at that time they may properly be called a sect; Palestine, Egypt, and Arabia were overrun with Marcionites; Osrhoëne was occupied by the followers

of Bardesanes and Harmonius, whose hymns so nearly took the place of national tunes that St. Ephrem found no better way of resisting the heresy than setting them to fresh words. Theodoret in Comagene speaks in the next century of reclaiming eight villages of Marcionites, one of Eunomians, and one of Arians.

'These sects were of very various character. Learning, eloquence, and talent were the characteristics of the Apollinarians, Manichees, and Pelagians; Tichonius the Donatist was distinguished in biblical interpretation; the Semi-Arian and Apollinarian leaders were men of grave and correct behaviour; the Novatians had sided with the orthodox during the Arian persecution; the Montanists and Messalians addressed themselves to an almost heathen population; the atrocious fanaticism of the Priscillianists, the fury of the Arian women of Alexandria and Constantinople, and the savage cruelty of the Circumcellions, can hardly be exaggerated. They had their orders of clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; their readers and ministers; their celebrants and altars; their hymns and litanies. They preached to the crowds in public, and their meeting-houses bore the semblance of churches. They had their sacristies and cemeteries; their farms; their professors and doctors; their schools. Miracles were ascribed to the Arian Theophilus, to the Luciferian Gregory of Elvira, to a Macedonian in Cyzicus, and to the Donatists in Africa.'

Such is Dr. Newman's account of the false Christs and false Churches of the fourth century. In the same volume he concludes his picture of the fifth and sixth centuries with the following summary :—

Fifth and sixth centuries. Ibid. Pages 314–317.

'Dreary and waste was the condition of the Church, and forlorn her prospects, at the period which we have been reviewing. After the brief triumph which attended the conversion of Constantine, trouble and trial had returned upon her. Her imperial protectors were failing in power or in faith. Strange forms of evil were rising in the distance, and were thronging for the conflict. There was but one spot in the whole of Christendom, one voice in the whole Episcopate, to which the faithful turned in hope in that miserable day. In the year 493, in the Pontificate of Gelasius, the whole of the East was in the hands of traitors to Chalcedon, and the whole of the West under the tyranny of the open enemies of Nicæa. Italy was the prey of robbers; mercenary bands had overrun its territory, and barbarians were seizing on its farms and settling in its villas. The peasants were thinned by famine and pestilence; Tuscany might be even said, as Gelasius words it, to contain scarcely a single inhabitant. Odoacer was sinking before Theodoric, and the Pope was changing one Arian master for another. And as if one heresy were not enough, Pelagianism was spreading with the connivance of the Bishops in the territory of Picenum. In the north of the dismembered empire, the Britons had first been infected by Pelagianism, and now were dispossessed by the heathen Saxons. The Armoricans still preserved a witness of Catholicism in the west of Gaul; but Picardy, Champagne, and the neighbouring provinces, where some remnant of its supremacy had been found, had lately submitted to the yet heathen Clovis. The Arian kingdoms of Burgundy in France, and of the Visigoths in Aquitaine and Spain, oppressed a zealous and Catholic clergy. Africa was in a still more deplorable condition under the cruel sway of the Vandal Gundamond: the

people indeed uncorrupted by the heresy, but their clergy in exile and their worship suspended.

While such was the state of the Latins, what had happened in the East? Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had secretly taken part against the Council of Chalcedon and was under Papal excommunication. Nearly all the whole East had sided with Acacius, and a schism had begun between East and West, which lasted for thirty-five years. The Henoticon was in force, and at the Imperial command had been signed by all the Patriarchs and Bishops throughout the Eastern empire. In Armenia the Churches were ripening for the pure Eutychianism which they adopted in the following century; and in Egypt the Acephali had already broken off from the Monophysite Patriarch, were extending in the east and west of the country, and preferred the loss of the Episcopal Succession to the reception of the Council of Chalcedon. And while Monophysites or their favourers occupied the Churches of the Eastern empire, Nestorianism was making progress in the territories beyond it. Barsumas had filled the See of Nisibis, Theodore was read in the schools of Persia, and the successive Catholici[1] of Seleucia had abolished Monachism and were secularising the clergy.

If, then, there is now a form of Christianity such, that it extends throughout the world, though with varying measures of prominence or prosperity in separate places;—that it lies under the power of sovereigns and magistrates, in different ways alien to its faith;—that flourishing nations and great empires, professing or tolerating the Christian name, lie over against it as antagonists;—that schools of philosophy and learning are supporting theories, and following out conclusions, hostile to it, and establishing an exegetical system subversive of its Scriptures;—that it has lost whole Churches by schism, and is now opposed by powerful communions once part of itself;—that it has been altogether or almost driven from some countries;—that in others its line of teachers is overlaid, its flocks oppressed,

[1] The title of the Nestorian Patriarchs.

its churches occupied, its property held by what may be called a duplicate succession ;—that in others its members are degenerate and corrupt, and surpassed in conscientiousness and in virtue, as in gifts of intellect, by the very heretics whom it condemns ;—that heresies are rife, and bishops negligent within its own pale ;—and that amid its disorders and fears there is but one Voice for whose decisions its people wait with trust, one Name and one See to which they look with hope, and that name Peter, and that see Rome ;—such a religion is not unlike the Christianity of the fifth and sixth centuries.'

Trials of the Church.

Thus did the great Searcher of Hearts then try the souls and spirits of His people; and the one sure star He sent to guide them was the Rome which guides us now. I give the statements as I find them. The comparison was drawn from outside the Church, although its author was then close upon her threshold; but the more unfavourable the view, the stronger becomes the argument. 'It is impossible,' said our Lord, 'that scandals should not come,' and we cannot lay claim to a present immunity from them. Still, though the Church has unsound members, her pale is free from heresies, nor can her existing hierarchy be charged with negligence. Her children, in general, are unsurpassed, in virtue at any rate, by any other. But, alas! there are exceptions. In a country pre-eminently Catholic, and by men who call themselves Catholic, the Roman Pontiff has been despoiled of large tracts of territory, and his exhortations, nay, even his very excommunications, have been disregarded and set at nought. Catholic hands have sacrilegiously laid hold of property which is conse-

St. Luke xvii. 1.

Existing scandals in Italy.

crated to the Most High God, and have impiously and barbarously turned adrift on the wide world, thousands of holy men and of religious women from out of the hallowed precincts of the cloister; precincts now perchance resounding with the ribald jest and the profane song, where so lately there went up the voice of prayer and sacred psalmody, of intercession for sinful man and of canticles to God's praise.

Defections of eminent men.

Nor are these the only scandals which now afflict the Church. She has to mourn over other unfaithful children, and even over some who were once looked up to as the teachers and the guides of the people, but who have fallen away and taken part in 'the contradiction of Core;' 'wandering stars;' 'murmurers, full of complaints.' 'These are they who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the Spirit.'

St. Jude. Ep. v. 11. 13. 16. 19.

Such trials ever have been, are, and will be a portion of the Church's warfare on this earth.

The Church's Golden Age.

The period previously described is precisely that which Anglicans regard as the Christian age of gold. It forms a portion of those happy halcyon days, during which they admit the outward visible unity of the Church of God, and unhesitatingly reject, as heretics and schismatics, all whom that Church rejected as such. It has been seen how the Christians of those ages were divided and rent asunder by disunions and divisions as great as there exist around us now. But nowhere throughout that period is there discernible among Catholics, the remotest trace of the acceptance of such a theory as that on which Anglicans are now tempted to repose in false security. It was

reserved for a later age to dream that a divinely appointed note of the Church might be hidden for a while, eclipsed and lost to sight, withdrawn by God in His displeasure at the wickedness of man:—that her outward unity might be suspended, and mankind reduced to the hope that, inwardly and invisibly, it might in some way still subsist. On the contrary, those ancient days abound in testimonies to the necessity of the visible, tangible, unity of the one Church, outward as well as inward, and to the hopelessness of salvation apart from her one fold.

Communion with Rome.

Neither can it be denied that the universal body of Christians which Anglicans themselves acknowledge to have formed, at that time, the one only Church, were always in outward communion with the Roman Pontiff. Passing differences or misapprehensions, might indeed occasionally give rise to an interruption of cordiality ; and there were times of coldness between the East and the West ; but early antiquity does not afford one single instance of an entire, systematic, and permanent suspension of outward communion with Rome, excepting in the case of those whom Anglicans themselves denounce as cut off from the body of the faithful. History renders it evident beyond a doubt, that, in those dark days of doubts and fears and perplexities, the one rallying point of Catholics, the general standard round which they gathered, was—Rome ; the test of their faith was—communion with the Roman See.

Ancient appellation of 'Roman.'

There are even instances which prove that in Arian times, as now, the actual appellation of *Roman*

was distinctively applied to Catholics, denoting approbation or reproach, as the case might be. Thus, in his *sacra*, addressed to the Berrhœan Bishop Acacius, and others, at the time of the Council of Ephesus, the Emperor Theodosius speaks of 'approved priests of the *Roman* religion.' Ruinart, in a note to his edition of St. Gregory of Tours, refers to an Arian Council at Toledo, which gave directions respecting the reception of persons 'from the *Roman* religion' into their party. St. Gregory of Tours himself says, distinctly,—'they are in the habit of calling (*vocitant*) men of our religion, *Romans*.' Du Cange quotes an instance from the writings of Lucifer of Cagliari, as follows:—'We *Romans* say that He' (the Son) 'is of one substance with the Father.' He refers also to Victor Vitensis, and a life of St. Eligius, to the same effect.

Hard. Conc. t. 1, col. 1687.

Hist. Franc. col. 248.

De Gloria Mart. col. 748, ed. Ruin.

Glossar. sub vocem *Romanus*.

It is said of Samson, in the Book of Judges, that 'he killed many more at his death, than he had killed before in his life.' The tenth century was bad enough whilst it lasted, but since it has gone, it has formed a perfect storehouse for weapons against the Church—a repertory for scandalous histories, by which others besides Dr. Forbes have too often been led astray. Cardinal Baronius himself was deceived by them. Its evils cannot be denied, but they have been allowed to obscure the recollection of the good, which atoned for them so amply, which fought with them, and won the day.

The Tenth Century. See the remark of Dr. Forbes, above, p. 73.

Rome was then a prey to factions and base

Rome in the Tenth Century.

intrigues. The tiara itself was at the bestowal of the worldly and unworthy, and the power of God alone could have supported and preserved the Church's centre, under a trial so severe. It is most worthy of note, and a visible sign of the Divine protection, that, with all the enormities charged on the lives of certain Popes of that age, not one public or official act of any of them was derogatory to the sanctity of St. Peter's chair. As regards their private characters, it is not investigation, but the shallow credulity of prejudice, which they mostly have to fear. So much as a century ago, the learned Muratori pointed out how little reliance can be placed on the scandalous histories fished out from defamatory libels and romances, and recorded by the partisan Liutprand; from whose writings they have been repeated and multiplied by more recent authors. In particular, he vindicates the characters of those much-abused Popes, Sergius III., and John X.

Annali d' Italia.

Sergius III.

The chronicle of Frodoard (who lived nearer to the time than Liutprand) describes the whole world as rejoicing at the election and reign of Sergius. He rebuilt the Lateran Basilica when all others despaired of it, 'flying for help,' says John the Deacon, 'to the divine mercy in which he always confided.' His epitaph records his love for his flock, and his resistance against invaders of holy things.

John X.

John X. formed the league which decisively repulsed the Saracens, the terror of the south of Italy at that time; and the panegyrist of Berengarius describes him as a Pontiff 'eminently illustrious in his

office, and full of wisdom.' After a reign of fourteen years, he ended his life in prison, where he was confined by Guy and Marozia, whose usurpations he had resisted. The story ran that he was smothered. Frodoard hesitates not to say that his soul escaped quickly to the throne decreed for him in heaven.

'Munificisque sacram decorans ornatibus aulam,
Pace nitet dum, Patricia deceptus iniqua,
Carcere conjicitur, claustrisque arctatur opacis.
Spiritus at sævis retineri non valet antris;
Emicat immo æthra decreta sedilia scandens.'

Frodoardus de Roman. Pontif. Muratori, an. 928.

It was the same century which (himself unwilling) saw the elevation to the Popedom of the pious Leo VII. History depicts him as a man of prayer and meditation, of large views and conciliatory manners, and he has left fifteen epistles, still extant, which testify to his piety, zeal, and learning. Marinus II., during the three years of his pontificate, strove earnestly to amend the ignorance of his times; and he had a worthy successor in Agapitus II., who reigned ten years. Other Popes there were in that age whose virtues were conspicuous. If so be (perhaps through deficiency or partiality of evidence) that the good fame of any is still obscured, we can but adore, with Card. Bellarmine, the inscrutable wisdom of God, which has permitted 'the gates of hell' to do their worst, whether by open violence or insidious snares of wickedness, in order that the world may perceive and own the impotence of Satan against the Church; and may acknowledge that the rock of Peter, on which it is built, is inviolable and impregnable,

Leo VII. and other Popes.

Migne, Patrol. Lat.

Præfat. in lib. de Summ. Pont. § 8.

because sustained by Almighty strength, and one with the everlasting rock,—with the Christ Who cannot fail.

Holiness always visible.

The Divine Spirit of Holiness is always present with God's Church, and visibly so. But Holiness may vary in the degrees of its manifestation, to an extent which Unity, from its very nature, never can do. The line of demarcation between unity and schism is evident and well defined, though men may be more or less near to it on either side. There are seasons when the Church's holiness shines out with an unusual lustre, and others when it is not so dazzling in its bright effulgence. Still that light is never hidden. There is no age of the Christian era which will afford any ground for the parallel apparently implied by Dr. Forbes,—that Holiness was hidden then, and that Unity may be hidden now: or for his theory,—that the external manifestation of either one or the other may be suspended, through a lessening of Christ's presence.

I do not deny that the tenth century was an age in which 'iniquity abounded, and many hearts grew cold' in love. But I maintain that heroic grace abounded also, and that numberless hearts then burnt with a charity whose flames burnt on in their successors, and have never since become extinct. It was a period of fierce struggle; sloth and worldliness invaded the sanctuary, and doubtless many wished that Christ should sleep. But it was not so, by any means, with all, nor was the wickedness consented to, or unresisted. In this hour of need the Church's

holiness was displayed by the efforts of a multitude of her children against the evil; and our Lord's presence was made manifest through His inspirations, which led earnest and faithful hearts to arouse Him by their cries. In that tenth century, prayers were put up, and deeds were done, and seeds were sown, whose result and produce, alone, may testify that their origin was from heaven, and that their sowing (albeit in tears) was in no barren or unblest soil. The Church must have succumbed had it not been for her intrinsic and divine holiness; which, so far from being obscured, shines out more bright and visible, from her trial and her triumph. Even the vehement contemporary denunciations both of councils and of individuals, while they reveal to us the evil, at the same time make manifest by their existence that it was neither triumphant nor universal. Holiness was all the while active throughout the Church—inwardly in the hearts of her children; outwardly and visibly in their works; and audibly in their denunciations of the abounding wickedness.

Evidences of Holiness in the Tenth Century.

Darras. Hist. Gén. de l'Église.

With all its drawbacks, this same tenth century witnessed the conversion to Christianity, of the Normans, Muscovites, Swedes, Poles, Hungarians, and other peoples. Harold, king of the Danes, demanded a miracle from the Christian priest Poppo, who was preaching to him the divinity of Christ. The man of God, in reply, held in his naked hand a red-hot iron, yet was not burned. The king embraced the faith, and Denmark received a Christian

hierarchy. The rudeness of the age was redeemed by many similar acts of heroic virtue.

The tenth century had its popular errors, but it cannot be accused of having given birth to one single heresy. It was not wanting in piety, as may be gathered from the mention found in its chronicles, of the practice (even among royal personages) of assisting at the nocturnal religious offices. On one occasion, the same page of history affords a revolting example of the barbarity of the times in the assassination of the Emperor Berengarius. Not dreaming of danger, he had chosen to pass the night in a small room from which he could easily reach the church, rather than in his palace which might have been defended. He had refused to have any guard; and he rose, as was his wont, for the public prayers, at the call of the midnight matins bell. He was met on his way by a band of conspirators, and foully murdered near the church's door.

Muratori, Annali, A.D. 924.

These contrasts form a special character of the age. Its scandals were grievous, but they were atoned for by numerous examples of surpassing brightness.

Saints of the Tenth Century.

The tenth century can boast of the holy Empress Saint Mathilda, foundress of so many nunneries, and mother to the Emperor Otho. His wife was St. Adelaide, and his brother was St. Bruno, the great Archbishop of Cologne. In England there reigned King Edgar the Peaceable, great in the power of his sway when rowed up the river Dee to the Church of St. John the Baptist, by eight

other kings, his vassals; but greater still in his humility, when, in obedience to Holy Church, he expiated a heinous crime by a seven years' public penance. He was succeeded by his son, the pure and holy Edward, enrolled as a Saint in the Church's calendar; and popularly styled a martyr also, through the love and veneration which his subjects bore him. Nor must St. Edith be forgotten, half-sister to St. Edward, who, when he was treacherously slain in the year 978, refused to quit her cloister, though invited to claim the throne. During this age, Venice beheld two of her doges (one of them was St. Peter Urseoli) put off their ducal robes and caps, and hide themselves under the cowl and tonsure of the cloister. At Constantinople, the century opened with the passage to a higher throne of the sainted Empress Theophania; the year 925 was marked by the decease of the Patriarch St. Nicholas, of the same city; and his place, but three years later, was filled by St. Tryphone. When the tenth age closed on Hungary, it left her king, St. Stephen, busied in rooting out idolatry from amongst his people; whilst he was cultivating in his own heart all Christian virtues and self-denial. In the same century were born and nursed up St. Henry II., the German emperor, and St. Cunegund, his spouse,—angelic examples of virginity in holy wedlock. It was the age of St. Adalbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg; and of his namesake, St. Adalbert, Bishop of Prague, called the Apostle of the Prussians; in whose country he

Butler, Sept. 1.

was honoured with a martyr's crown. St. Ulric of Augsburg; St. Wolfgang; our own St. Dunstan, and St. Oswald the Bishop; the Scotch St. Cadroe; the Irish St. Cormac, Bishop of Cashel and King of Munster; were amongst the many who adorned it. The virtues of St. Radbod, who governed the diocese of Utrecht, rivalled those of the primitive Bishops, and he was 'excessive,' says Butler, 'in his charity to the poor.'

Lives of the Saints. Nov. 29.

St. Nicon the Metanoite.

In Greece, St. Nicon (called, from his constant cry, the Μετανοεῖτε, or *Do Penance*), after converting the Armenians from prevalent errors, was evangelizing Crete, (which had lately been rescued from the yoke of the Saracens,) and working wonders in the Peloponnese.

Baronius, an. 961, &c.

Bollandists, May 25. March 1. April 22.

Spain and Portugal had their St. Gennadius and others; they had St. Rudisind the Bishop, and his sister the Abbess, St. Senorina, to whom her holy brother's decease was revealed by angelic voices chanting the *Te Deum*, whilst she was at Compline with her nuns.

St. Nilus Butler, Sept. 26

In Calabria was found St. Nilus the younger. It was he whom the Emperor Otho visited, where he dwelt amongst his monks who lived around him in poor scattered huts. The Emperor offered lands and endowments, and bade the holy Abbot to ask what favour he most desired. St. Nilus would accept nothing of this world, but he did not refuse to solicit a favour of another kind. 'All that I ask of you,' he said, 'is to save your own soul; for, though Emperor, you must die and give an account to God.'

In the north of Italy, Bishop Atto of Vercelli, after the example of many others, was loud in his denunciation of the abuses of the age.

Atto of Vercelli.

There, too, under the holy hermit Marinus, the great St. Romuald was commencing that austere but loving life of heroic sanctity and contemplation, which bore such abundant fruit both in his own and future generations. Multitudes were moved by him to repentance; whilst he went about, as if a seraph in divine love, inflaming all who heard him speak. In the Vatican gallery there hangs a painting—a masterpiece of Andrea Sacchi—which represents the vision, wherein St. Romuald saw a ladder like to Jacob's, 'standing upon the earth, and the top thereof touching heaven'; whilst on it there went up a white-robed long procession of his children in Jesus Christ, an ascending train of holy monks from the order which he founded, and which derived its title from their monastery at Campo Maldoli, the two words being contracted to Camaldoli. It was situated in a large and retired valley, the gift of a rich lord, named Maldoli, whose memory has been thus happily perpetuated in connection with that wonderful religious foundation, wherein lives on to our own day the spirit of their first holy Abbot—St. Romuald—offspring of the tenth century.

St. Romuald and Camaldoli.

Butler, Feb. 7.

It was in the same age that the young Bernard, of the château of Menthon in Savoy, son of a powerful baron, fled (like a second St. Alexis) from a sumptuous banquet at his father's house, on the eve

The Hospice of St. Bernard.

Bollandists. Act. SS. 15 Jun.

of the espousals destined for him, and when his father was on the point of surrendering to him the barony. They sought him in the morning, and he was gone; but a writing met their eyes, which said :—'O sweetest parents, I beg of you, rejoice. My King and Saviour is my guide; seek me no more, nor spend on me your care. I wish not to marry; I wish not to reign on earth; I wish to reach high heaven.' In obedience to a celestial vision, he made his way to the Archdeacon of Aosta. In after years he succeeded to the office; and it was then that, inspired with charity for the wayfaring, and with zeal for God's glory, he either founded or restored, amidst the Alpine snows and barren rocks, the two hospices through which his name has since been given to the passes of the Great and Little St. Bernard. The former was previously called the Hill of Jupiter; and the legend tells of a huge infernal statue, or idol, on its summit, the dread of all travellers, which the holy Bernard in the might of God destroyed. In the same strength he rooted out from those regions the still lingering remains of the heathen worship of Jupiter. He was styled the 'Apostle of the Alps,' and he was equally active and successful in his missionary work in Lombardy. He undertook a journey to Rome, to obtain the Pontifical approbation of the rules for his monastic institutions on the Alps, which he placed under the protection of his sure and never-deserted patron, St. Nicholas. Those institutions have borne their

fruits. The glow of their divine charity, unchilled amidst the surrounding ice and snow, has ever since been renowned and venerated throughout the world. St. Bernard of Menthon died in a good old age, 'full of days' and full of holiness—of days each one of which was full; full of loving piety to his God, and of loving service to his neighbour.

Switzerland. Abbey of St. Gall.

At that period the Abbey of St. Gall, in Switzerland, was celebrated for the learning, and eminent for the piety and sanctity of its monks. In the early part of the century, under the direction of the Abbot, there abode in a small and neighbouring cell the recluse St. Wiborada: the blessed Rachel was her disciple. The year 976 was marked by the death of the holy Bishop, St. Conrad, who, for forty-two years, had ruled the diocese of Constance with unwearied watchfulness and zeal. Saint Gebherd soon afterwards became its Bishop.

St. Conrad. Butler, Nov. 26.

Einsiedeln.

In the time of the above-named St. Conrad was founded the great Abbey of Einsiedeln, whose church is said to have been consecrated by angelic or Divine hands. It was built over the cell of St. Meinrad, where, in the preceding century, that holy hermit had sanctified his soul, and met his death at the hands of assassins. St. Conrad has himself recorded, that, during the night of September 14th, 948, which preceded his intended consecration of the church, mysterious and marvellous voices reached his ears; and in the morning, when, after long hesitation, he was at length about to commence the

ceremony, he was prevented by these words :—'Stay, brother! God Himself has consecrated this chapel.'

St. Ludmilla. St. Wenceslas. Brev. Roman. Sept. 28.

In Bohemia it was the age of St. Ludmilla and St. Wenceslas, both of them of sovereign rank, and martyrs. It was by love that the Duke St. Wenceslas ruled his subjects, and it was love for God and man which ruled supreme in his own breast. He would rise by night in secret, and carry heavy burdens of wood for fuel to the doors of the needy; he was a father to the orphan, a friend to the friendless and the captive, a consoler and helper of all in distress. He bound himself by a vow of celibacy to a life of angelic purity, and it is said that angels were seen in attendance on him on more than one occasion. He would go about to the churches by night, in the snow and ice, with naked and bleeding feet, leaving behind him their prints, which warmed the frozen earth (*sanguinea et terram calefacientia post se relinquens vestigia*). It was in the year 938, at midnight, in or near a church to which, as usual, his devotion conducted him, that he was slaughtered by his own brother, at the instigation of their unnatural and pagan mother, Drahomira. It was by the hands of her assassins, also, that his grandmother, St. Ludmilla, who brought him up, had previously been strangled.

Gandersheim. Roswitha.

In that part of Lower Saxony, now called Brunswick, the Convent of Gandersheim was exhaling the sweet odour of sanctity all through this evil age. Founded in the latter half of the ninth century by Duke Liutolf and his wife Oda, and ruled succes-

sively by three of their own daughters, its nuns were conspicuous for their monastic discipline, and assiduous study of the Holy Scriptures. Here dwelt the pious Roswitha, the reputed authoress of a series of Christian melodrames, which she composed, says the preface attributed to her, in anxiety that the talent with which she was entrusted should not be eaten away by the rust of neglect, but rather that it should resound with the Divine praise, under the constant mallet of devotion. *Sedulo malleo devotionis percussum divinæ laudationis referret tinnitum.*

The authenticity of these poems has recently been called in question, but no doubt has been raised respecting the sanctity of the convent of Gandersheim during the period before us.

Cluny and its Abbots.

At the very opening of the tenth century, the virtues of Berno, the holy Abbot of Baume, attracted the notice of Duke William of Aquitaine, who solicited from him the foundation of a new monastery within his own domain, on whatever site he should select. It is said that the abbot fixed on the spot then occupied by the Duke's kennels. 'You need only,' said the man of God, 'turn out the hounds, and let in the monks.' The Duke assented; and thus, in the year 909, was founded that great Abbey of Cluny, nursery of Saints, and parent of numerous offshoots. Its first abbot, the blessed Berno, governed seven religious houses. At his death he was succeeded by the great St. Odo, who was three times summoned to Rome by the Popes, to reconcile

differences amongst princes, and to effect conventual reforms. It was he who gave the caution to his monks never to close their doors to the blind, the sick, or the beggar, 'for these,' said he, 'will be the doorkeepers of the kingdom of heaven.' He was a lover of silence, which he called 'the father of holy thoughts and of great deeds.' 'Peace and charity,' he was wont to say, 'dwell in a community where silence reigns.' He died in the year 942, and was succeeded by St. Aymard. St. Mayeul followed in 965. He laboured with success in reforming and restoring various monastic houses in Italy. The Pontifical throne was offered to him, but he excused himself as unfitted. He died A.D. 994. His successor was St. Odilo, one of the first promoters of the great truce of God, that merciful alleviation to the miseries of the time. Thus, all through the tenth century, the spirit of sanctity was predominant amidst the holy monks of Cluny; and, after a brief period, there issued forth from the same cloisters, as another giant to run his course, the great reformer Hildebrand, the high-minded St. Gregory VII., strong in truth and justice, and in the power and grace of God.

Hidden Saints.

Such are a few of the prominent marks of holiness which adorned the tenth century, and made manifest the active presence and assistance of the God of holiness, in His one true Church ruled over by the Roman Pontiff. The catalogue is incomplete, yet it is so long as to appear a digression. More might be added from history; and, besides this,

how much there must be that remains hidden to us! The name of each Saint enrolled in the Church's calendar, implies a host of hidden Saints, who are only known in heaven. It implies an antecedent sanctity from which the flame was caught; it implies sanctity in those around who helped to nurse it; it implies both contemporary and prospective sanctity in the many whom that holy man instructed in the love of God—in all who, by his precepts and example, were helped to save their souls, whether in his lifetime or after his decease. The same must be said of every monastery which is founded—of every good work which stands recorded. Such acts are never single or isolated, in their origin or their existence. They neither spring from nothingness, nor do they subsist on nothingness, nor do they vanish into nothingness. Each deed of grace whose memory has survived to us involves many others, which, though lost to time, are treasured for eternity, an unknown multitude, to be revealed at the day of judgment.

I affirm, then, that during the tenth century, as in all others, the Roman Catholic, the one only, Church, was not merely the fosterer, the refuge, and the home of supernatural holiness; its protector and its preserver; not merely was she the dispenser of the means of holiness; the appointed guardian and keeper of its divinely constituted channels; but over and above all this, the Spirit of holiness shone manifestly and brightly both within her and all around her—she was visibly, and plainly, and distinctly, holy; then, as now,

and as always; holy in her works; holy in her loving patience; holy in her exhortations; holy in the lives of her true children; holy in the supernatural and heroic grace of the many Saints who, like shining lights, never ceased to illuminate the gross darkness of that period, and who protested by their words and deeds against its many and crying iniquities. And ere the tenth century passed away, it gave birth to a very phœnix of divine and burning love, who arose as it were from its ashes, the great and holy St. Peter Damian (born about the year 988), the precursor of St. Gregory VII.; the denouncer of abuses, and reviver of interior discipline, who, during the age which followed, like another St. John Baptist, prepared the way for those wonderful reformations which so happily characterised its close. Severe in life; ardent in temperament, which he subdued and converted into holy zeal; a lover of solitude, charity, and humility; there are few names more distinguished in the Church's annals, and more eminent amongst her mediæval Saints, than his whose official signature is appended to a Papal Bull, preserved at Monte Cassino, as—'*Peter the sinner, Bishop of Ostia.*'

St. Peter Damian.

Men may fall away, but Christ's presence is not lessened.

It is impossible that any one note of the Church can ever become invisible. There may be certain periods in her history which seem more clouded or more bright than others; seasons when her Lord appears to sleep, as well as others when He arises to assuage the tempest. But, whether sleeping or

e is always there; there, in 'the fulness esence,' which is never 'lessened,' never never hidden, or eclipsed.

hometan impiety of old, and the more recent es of infidelity, are no such signs as Dr. pposes,—of a lessening of Christ's presence one universal Church. Long ages previous, sts of angels were 'given over to' the fires of God's presence was not lessened in those m which they were expelled.—'There was battle in heaven, Michael and his angels ith the dragon, and the dragon fought and : and they prevailed not, neither was their nd any more in heaven. And that great was cast out, that old serpent, who is called and satan, who seduceth the whole world: was cast unto the earth, and his angels were thrown down with him.'—Here is the very type, the root, the origin, the source, of all schism and of all pride. Had heaven sinned, that its unity was thus impaired?

P. 74, above.

Apocalypse, xii. 7–9.

'Angels are bright still, though the brightest fell.'

What strange theory is this? Does the gospel suit it, or it the gospel? When Jesus taught the great mystery of the holy Eucharist, and 'many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him,' was His blessed presence lessened with the faithful remnant of whom He asked—'Will you also go away?' Was it lessened with the chosen twelve, though He then declared that one of them was 'a

St. John, ch. vi.

Ibid. vv. 67, 68, 71.

devil'? And when that very one betrayed Him to the cross, and when others fled and left Him, was He less with His Church then, at the moment that He died for her?

Were there no schisms and heresies in the apostolic age which followed, and to which Dr. Forbes himself appeals as a time of the fulness of Christ's presence? Hear the beloved Apostle—'As you have heard that Antichrist cometh; even now there are become many Antichrists: whereby we know that it is the last hour: They went out from us; but they were not of us.' Again, St. Jude,—'These are they, who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the Spirit.' And St. Paul speaks of it as a necessity,—'There must be also heresies: that they also, who are reproved, may be made manifest among you.'

1 St. John ii. 18, 19.

Ep. ver. 19.

1 Cor. xi. 19.

Our Lord never said that the vigour of the sap of His one true vine should be abated, because of the fruitless branches He cut off. When He threatened the individual churches in the Apocalypse with severance from the body, He never told His faithful that the body itself should have less share in the outpouring and the indwelling of His Holy Spirit.

Nor when the early heresies sprang up was that gracious presence lessened. Nay, the worse the assaults of Satan, the nearer to us is our God. 'Where wert thou, Lord,' asked St. Catherine of Siena, 'when my soul was flooded and overwhelmed with foul imaginings and evil thoughts?' 'In the midst of thee,' was the reply, 'to preserve thee from

perdition.' So is it with the Church. God never will suspend her living, acting, visible, unity, whether subjective or objective, or of any kind whatever. Her unity is Divine, and this embraces all unities. This admits of no abatements or lessenings, no severings or distinguishings, no splittings or philosophizings. She is One, as God is One.

Visible Unity never suspended.

If the Church's visible unity could ever be suspended, it must have been so in those troublous days of the fourth century, of which I have already spoken. Contemporary authorities, both from West and East, describe their miserable dissensions in the most vivid colours. St. Hilary of Poitiers addresses the Emperor Constantius in language well calculated to convey an idea of their confusion.

He tells him:—

Ad Constantium Lib. ii. 4, 5, 6.

'We are in a condition most dangerous and deplorable; for now there exist as many faiths as inclinations, as many doctrines as fashions, and there spring up as many causes of blasphemies as there are vices. . . . .

'Whilst men fight in words, question about novelties, dispute about ambiguities, complain about authors, strive about pursuits, whilst there is difficulty in agreement, and one begins to be anathema to the other: hardly any one now is Christ's. For we fluctuate with the uncertain wind of doctrines: if we teach, we disturb; if we are taught, we go astray. . . . Every year, nay every month, we decree new faiths respecting God; when decreed we repent of them, we defend the repentant, and we anathematise the defended; either in our own we condemn what belongs to others, or in others we condemn what is our own; and biting one another, we are now consumed of one another.

'Then men seek for faith as if they possessed it not.

They require it to be written, as if it was not in their hearts. We, who are regenerated through faith, are now taught respecting faith, as if our regeneration were without it.'

Further, he designates, as among the chief causes of their miseries, two evils, which are characteristic of the present age also—viz. that men 'avoid believing concerning the Lord Christ those things which He taught were to be believed about Him;' and that 'under the specious name of peace they steal into a unity which betrays the faith.' '*Per speciosum pacis nomen in unitate perfidiæ subrepimus.*'

In the East there arose a corresponding cry from St. Gregory Nazianzen:—

Orat. ii. 81.

'All things have become again as at the first, before the world was, whilst as yet it was devoid of the form and comely order we now behold; but the chaotic and disordered mass required the form-bestowing hand and power. Or, if you will, we are like men in a nocturnal combat, who, under the faint rays of the moon, know not friends from foes; or, as if in a naval fight and stormy sea, stunned, and perplexed, and deprived of an opportunity for manly deeds by the blows of the winds, and the seething surge, and the onrush of the waves, and the clashing of the ships, and the thrusts of the poles, and the calls of the commanders, and the groans of the falling—alas, what grief! we fall foul of one another, and are destroyed by one another.'

Such is the testimony borne by two holy Bishops and Doctors, then living, to the state of the Christian world in the fourth century; ere yet Anglicans would consider Christ's presence to have 'lessened.' It prepares us for the account given by a Pagan historian of

the same age, who states that owing to their dissensions, the Emperor Julian 'found there were no wild beasts so dangerous to men as most of the Christians were destructive to themselves.' '*Nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus.*'

Ammianus Marcellinus. Lib. xxii. 5.

Yet, when we contemplate those times from the vantage ground of what was then a futurity of fifteen centuries, we perceive, distinct and evident through the mixed medley of contending parties, the clear outlines of the one church; the comely form of the one spouse; the well-fenced and visible fold of the one shepherd; in which alone were to be found the waters of eternal life, and outside of which no wanderer could be Christ's. So will it be, in ages yet to come, when generations now unborn look back upon our present age. So is it now with the holy angels, and with all those blessed ones who are looking down upon us from the heavenly realms of peace.

Distinction between Individuals and The Church.

There is a strange fallacy which runs through Dr. Forbes's argument, and which arises from his not distinguishing between divine promises and precepts to individual Christians or to individual churches, and those which are addressed to the universal Church of Christ. An individual Christian, though 'purchased by the blood of God that he should be holy,' may forfeit his high heritage and defile 'the temple of the Holy Ghost,' casting away the priceless gifts of 'love and peace and all other fruits of the Spirit.' He may

See extract, above, p. 73.

sin against the distinguishing mark of Christ's disciple, that of love to all the brethren. Christ gave it as a mark of His true followers, but He never promised that each of them should always keep it. Whereas it has been already shown, that, in a way which pledged God's word in perpetuity, 'it was said of the whole Church, "That they may be one as We are."'

See above, pp. 7–14.

Again—surely no reasonable man would gather from the prophecy or assertion that, 'the priest's lips should keep knowledge,' that every priest was infallible, but rather that such was the appointed and ordinary channel through which the people were to learn the knowledge of God. Whereas the declaration that the Church's 'teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more,' is manifestly a prophecy which includes a solemn promise.

The children of The Church are taught by God. See the extract, above, p. 73.

Dr. Forbes observes also that, 'if the gospel had its full course, every priest should be holy, and "all the children" of the Church "taught by God."' Now, there are few, if any, more striking proofs of the indwelling presence of God within the Roman Catholic Church, than the large, and ample, and literal fulfilment within her, of the promise of divine teaching and guidance for every individual soul who does not wilfully turn away from it. It is fulfilled outwardly and inwardly, collectively and individually. The living voice of God is heard in ways most manifold, through the organ of the Church His living temple, 'the teacher from God,' who speaks with God's authority.

Through the Church's creeds, her dogmatic decrees, her sermons, her catechisms, her offices, her practices, her devotions, and the like, her children are, all of them, 'taught by God.' Again, each one is 'taught by God' in that wonderful sacrament of surpassing, superhuman mercy and condescension, the blessed sacrament of penance, wherein the poor sinner pours out his burdened heart to the minister of his God and Saviour; or rather, through the ear of that minister to the tender, yearning heart of that God and Saviour Himself, of Jesus Who is there to enlighten His servant, and to pardon through His servant's lips. It is there that the penitent unfolds the trials and temptations of his Christian warfare; and not only does the cleansing blood of Jesus wash away his stains, but through the self-same minister the voice of God is heard; guiding and directing; consoling or warning; encouraging; and, if sometimes threatening, ever loving, ever merciful. Thus, through the outward ear, is each one 'taught by God,' and led on his own particular path to heaven; and he is not only taught it, but he is enabled to follow it, through the grace which the sacrament conveys. Outward teaching.

But there is another teaching still, and who shall unfold its mysteries? God's inward voices to the faithful Christian soul are far beyond all human words, or human thoughts. The removal of every obstacle to the hearing, or the understanding, or the obeying of these heavenly whispers; the interpretation of the divine will thus manifested in secret; Inward teaching.

counsel to promote and to assist each one, in the most simple, childlike, and full co-operation with the light and grace thus lovingly vouchsafed;—these are the objects of the sublime office of the direction of souls, which is divinely entrusted to the duly qualified amongst the Church's ministers, through whom God teaches the humble of heart, and preserves His cherished flock from being led astray by the delusions of their own imaginations, or by false spirits which are not from Him. Thus He assists His chosen people to follow His leadings, and to correspond to the calls and the workings of His grace.

All are not obedient.

Most truly and most fully, then, are all the Church's children 'taught by God.' But it is nowhere promised that all shall listen or obey. We are warned by our Lord Himself to expect the contrary. He has taught us expressly that His Church on earth contains both the just and the wicked, and will always do so till the last. Nor are His priests exempted from this rule. They are called, it is true, to an especial holiness, and their office is always holy, but there is no more promise of holiness to them individually, than there is to any other. Like others, they may fall short of their vocation, and prove unworthy of their sacred office; and, as if to forewarn us to be prepared for such scandals, we find a Judas even amongst the apostles selected by our blessed Lord in person.

St. Matthew, ch. xiii.

The Church exists for the salvation

'My thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the hea-

vens are exalted above the earth, so are my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts. And as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return no more thither, but soak the earth, and water it, and make it to spring, and give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth: it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall prosper in the things for which I sent it.' The Church is for man, not man for the Church; and the word of God which called it into being 'shall prosper in the things for which He sent it.' The Church is God's ambassador, charged with His commission to preach the gospel to the whole world, so long as time endures, and to convey the means of grace to every soul that is athirst for the heavenly streams of life. God's word is pledged that His gospel shall never fail, therefore that word guarantees to us that the Church, to whom the gospel has been entrusted by Him, will never forfeit or be deprived of any, be it even the least, of all those endowments and prerogatives that are needed for the end for which He sent her. Had God Himself not pledged His word, we might have feared lest the sins of man should prove too much for His amazing patience, and lest 'the blessings of the gospel' should become forfeited. But His thoughts are not our thoughts, nor our ways His ways. The deeper the abyss of our misery, the fuller becomes the abyss of His mercy. His word shall not return to him void:

of mankind. Isaias lv. 8–11.

like the fruitful rain that soaks into the earth, it shall prosper in the things for which He sent it. The Church collectively, as teacher of the nations and stewardess of the sacraments, is not on her probation; though all her members are, priests as well as people, from the supreme Pontiff on the chair of Peter, down to the little child just washed in the baptismal font. The Church collectively, has an end for which she exists; and so has each one of her members, individually. Her children are here to save their souls, and to reach the everlasting enjoyment of their God in heaven, by knowing, and loving, and serving Him faithfully in this life. This is the season of their probation, and, if they fail, their end is lost for ever. The Church is here to assist them in their trial, to help them on their way, to conduct them to their God, Who is their end and their beginning. For this she exists and is on earth. The failure of the Church in aught requisite for this, would be the failure of God Himself, who constituted her for this very purpose. It would be the failure of His Word to the universal race of man.

God's promises to the Church are absolute and unconditional.

Hence, no analogy whatever can be drawn between God's promises to individuals, and His promises to the universal Church. The former are dependent and conditional, unless they affect the universal interests. The latter are absolute and unconditional, because they cannot be separated from the universal interests. Thus, there is no promise that an individual priest shall not be a wicked man; and, if he

is so, his judgment may be more severe than that of others. But it is a great Catholic truth—to adopt the language of the Anglican 26th Article—that 'the unworthiness of the ministers hinders not the effect of the sacraments;' . . . 'which be effectual,' as it further says, 'because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.' The sacraments were instituted for the universal good, and no amount of individual evil can lessen their *intrinsic* virtue. If the recipient is in evil dispositions it will prevent their efficacy in his own case, and may even turn the blessing into condemnation; but the fulness of the sacraments themselves will in nowise be impaired, nor Christ's presence in them lessened. So is it with the Church. Outwardly as well as inwardly, she is always holy, though comprising a mixed multitude; and though, so long as the world shall endure, she will contain both the wicked and the good. Outwardly as well as inwardly, she is always one; though many have fallen away, and have gone out from her, who were not of her. Always,—whatever may be the accumulation and the heinousness of human wickedness—always in the midst of her, in the fulness of the Divine Presence, is Christ our God, and His ever-abiding Spirit. He has sent her forth to overcome the universal evil, and, therefore, the stronger that evil waxes, the more securely may she rely on the persevering constancy of His assistance, from Whom alone she derives her strength, and in Whom alone she lives.

1 St. John ii. 19.

Distinction between ordinary and extraordinary gifts.

There are doubtless times when the grace of God is more largely and manifestly poured out than at others,—occasions when it may be said to overflow. It is not that it is ever lessened, for it is always present in superabundance; but it is that there are seasons of its miraculous manifestation; or, to speak more exactly, when it becomes more manifestly miraculous, for a miracle it always is. Dr. Forbes seems to have overlooked this consideration, when he says that Christ 'is not with us as He was with the Apostles, in that they were "full of the Holy Ghost." Doubtless, the Apostles had extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, all of which were not handed down to their successors. Such gifts may have been independent of their apostolic office; or else not required for the Church's mission in the ages which were to follow. But 'the fulness of God's presence' does not always bring these gifts. We are nowhere told that they were communicated to St. Stephen, yet he is described, in express terms, as 'full of faith, and *of the Holy Ghost.*' Now, unity is not one of these extraordinary gifts. It is an unceasing mark of the Church, and declared to be so in the Creed of the Apostles. It belongs, therefore, to her essence, it is necessary to her, and can never be withdrawn. It distinguishes her from others; therefore it never can be hidden. Its continuance and its visibility are requisite for her Gospel Mission; therefore they have their place among the 'faithful mercies of David,' guaranteed to us by the eternal Truth.

See above, p. 74.

Acts vi. 5.

This, then, is the answer to Dr. Forbes's observa-

tion that, though our Lord has promised to be always with us, 'He has not promised to be always present in the same degree or the same way.' The comment is true as regards the extraordinary effusions of God's grace, or manifestations of His power. It is not true of all that is essential, or, in any needful way, auxiliary, to the life or the mission of His Church. Therefore, it is not true of visible unity, which forms one of her constituent parts and features, which is one of her dearest and most cherished prerogatives; necessary for the fulfilment of her mission; a note that she is God's messenger, and a characteristic of God's message.

Christ's presence never varies in essentials. See extract, above, pp. 73, 74.

The promise was made by Christ at the same solemn moment that He sent forth His Church to teach and to baptize all nations, and to instruct them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded her. Therefore it manifestly implies no variation of His assisting presence in anything which may be required for the fulfilment of that commission. But it not only implies this, it expresses it, by the word—'*alway*,'—or, as more literally in the Douay version,—'*all days*.'—In the Greek it is πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας. The words are too plain to admit of any doubt.—*Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*—It is not only—I *will be* with you, it is the unchangeable—*I am*—that is to say:—as now, so for ever; and that, 'in the same degree and the same way,' as regards all that is required for the fulfilment of the commission

St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

then conferred. Every day, and in all the days, whatever they may be; in evil days, and in good days; in days of persecution, and in days of triumph; in days when wickedness is found in the highest places (as in Judas, among the Apostles), and in days when Priest and Pontiff excel alike in virtue, as in office; in days when the Church is mourning through the iniquity of faithless children (though iniquity never shall prevail), and in days when she is the admiration of the whole earth, resplendent with grace, and conspicuous for sanctity. The promise is absolute and unconditional, that is, if it requires any conditions for its fulfilment, it includes a guarantee that they shall not be wanting.

God pledges His word to man. He strives to raise man's fainting courage for the accomplishment of His great ends of mercy, in which He makes him His co-operator. Why, then, should men, poor faithless worms of earth, explain God's blessed promise all away? God says,—'I am with you all your days.' Alas! shall man reply,—'True, Lord; but you do not say you are always present in the same degree or the same way'? Should we not do wrong to a fellow-mortal if we thus questioned his generosity? We cannot trust too fully to the word of the eternal God. We cannot interpret it too largely, in such a case as this. He is not one to mislead us with artificial language—

> To palter with us in a double sense;
> To keep the word of promise to our ear,
> And break it to our hope.

I repeat, that I am not speaking of those especial manifestations of His presence which, in His loving wisdom, He vouchsafes or withholds as befits the times and seasons, but of all that which appertains to the constitution and essence of the Church, as is the case with visible unity; of all that is requisite for her mission, to which visible unity is indispensable; and of all that belongs to her characteristic Notes, of which Unity is one; and it could not be a Note at all if it were not visible.

The peculiar force of the words.

Every word of the promise is remarkable. It is particularly to be observed that the expression—*I am with you*, on the part of God,—has a special force, wherever it is found throughout the pages of Holy Scripture. It invariably conveys an assurance of success by means of unfailing and extraordinary divine assistance. On the other hand, the expression—I am *not* with you—is used in the reverse sense. This has been exemplified by Professor Murray in a list of texts which fill several pages, and from which I select a very few.

Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi, vol. ii. p. 199, &c.

Gen. xxvi. 24.

ch. xxxi. 3.

Thus, God says to Isaac,—'Do not fear, for *I am with thee*'—and to Jacob,—'Return into the land of thy fathers and to thy kindred, and *I will be with thee.*' Again, when God sent Moses to deliver Israel;—'And Moses said to God: Who am I that I should go to Pharao, and should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt? And He said to him: *I will be with thee.*' Before Israel was defeated by the Amalekites, God commanded Moses: 'Say to them: Go not up,

Exod. iii. 11, 12.

Deuteron. i. 42.

and fight not, for *I am not with you.*' To Josue, God said :—' As I have been with Moses, so *will I be with thee.*' When Israel sinned and fled before their enemies, God showed His presence and assistance by removing the hindrance to their ultimate victory, by threatening them through Josue :—' *I will be no more with you*, till you destroy him that is guilty of this wickedness ;' at the same time putting it into their hearts to do as He commanded, and thus fulfilling His previous promise. It was the greeting of the Angel to Gedeon :—' The Lord *is with thee*, O most valiant of men.' And when God bade him go in his strength and deliver Israel, Gedeon 'answered and said: I beseech Thee, my Lord, wherewith shall I deliver Israel? Behold my family is the meanest in Manasses, and I am the least in my father's house. And the Lord said to him: *I will be with thee*: and thou shalt cut off Madian as one man.'

Josue i. 5.

Jos. vii. 12.

Judges vi. 12.

Ibid. 14-16.

This, too, was the Archangel's salutation to her, from whom sprang the Saviour and Deliverer of mankind; to 'Mary, of whom was born Jesus;' Whose name, also, was '*Emmanuel*, which being interpreted is, *God with us.*'—' And the Angel being come in, said unto her: Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women.'—' Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη· ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.'

St. Matt. i. 16. 23.

St. Luke i. 28.

It is this which St. Peter spoke of the Christ Himself:—' Jesus of Nazareth: how God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were op-

Acts x. 38.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

pressed by the devil, *for God was with Him*:'—ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

It is this which the Lord Christ has promised to His one Church, and which He will never fail to make good in all its fulness:—'*Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*'—*All days*, without any intermission, or suspension, or interruption, *I am with you*; I, the Sun of Justice, who know no setting, who change not like the moon, now more, now less; I, Emmanuel, *am with you*; not in different degrees or different ways, according to the variations of the fickle human heart, or as if dependent on its movements; but, *all days*, I, the great I AM, *am with you*. The very construction of the sentence, in the Greek, is calculated to increase our confidence. It is as if our dearest Lord made haste to unite us with Him, to make both one, to enclose us, as it were, in the midst of His own great and awful, but most soul-assuring, everlasting Name—I *with you* AM—ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.

What need we more? Yet Dr. Forbes teaches that Holy Scripture 'does not say what degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel.' However true this assertion as regards individual churches or individual Christians, it is most gratuitous and unfounded if applied to the universal and everlasting Church of God. Pitiable indeed would be the lot of the poor human race if for the universal blessings of the Gospel they were depen-

See above, p. 73.

dent upon human merits. The sins of man did not prevent the coming of the Messiah (though it is maintained that they did so by certain of the Jews), nor shall they hinder the fulfilment of the work He came to do, by lessening His blessed presence, or dividing His one fold.—'Behold the Lord God shall come with strength, and His arm shall rule: behold His reward is with Him and His work is before Him.'

Isaias xl. 10.

If the words of Christ are not enough, if His prayer and promise can be explained away, what remains but to turn to the overwhelming testimony of those divine prophecies of the ancient covenant, 'whereunto,' says the Apostle, 'you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place'?

2 St. Peter i. 19.

Prophecies of the Old Testament.

It may not be amiss then, as briefly as possible amidst such a profusion of choice, to select a few of the most prominent of those glowing pledges of the constant, abiding, ever-present, faithful assistance of our dear and loving God, which He has so lavishly vouchsafed to us through the voices of His ancient prophets; as if to relieve a Divine Heart overcharged with love, and with fears lest man should lose his confidence and trust; lest, through sin and infirmity, he should be tempted to doubt of the long-suffering, never-failing, never-tiring, never-exhausted, never-suspended, infinite mercy and patience of Him, Who 'waiteth that He may have mercy on us: and shall be exalted sparing us:' Who 'is compassionate and merciful: long-suffering and plenteous in mercy. . . . . Who hath not dealt with us according to our sins: nor rewarded us according to our

Isaias xxx. 18.

Psalm ciii.

iniquities. . . . . For He knoweth our frame. He remembereth that we are dust.'

'And Sion said: The Lord hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on the son of her womb? and if she should forget, yet will not I forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee in my hands: thy walls are always before my eyes.' Isaias xlix. 14–16.

'A child is born to us, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the World to come, the Prince of Peace. His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace: He shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom: to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever: the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.' Ch. ix. 6, 7.

'And now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and formed thee, O Israel: Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, and called thee by thy name: thou art mine. When thou shalt pass through the waters, I will be with thee, and the rivers shall not cover thee: when thou shalt walk in the fire, thou shalt not be burnt, and the flames shall not burn in thee: For I am the Lord thy God; the holy One of Israel, thy Saviour.' Isaias xliii.

'Lift up your eyes to heaven, and look down to the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish like smoke, and the earth shall be worn away like a garment, and the inhabitants thereof shall perish in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my justice shall not fail.' Ibid. ch. li. 6.

'I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the faithful mercies of David. . . . and the Lord shall be named for an everlasting sign, that shall not be taken away.' Isaias lv. 3, 13.

'Because thou wast forsaken, and hated, and there was none that passed through thee, I will make thee to be an everlasting glory, a joy unto generation and generation.' Ch. lx. 15.

'For as the new heavens, and the new earth, which I make to stand before me, saith the Lord: so shall your Ch. lxvi. 22, 23.

seed stand, and your name. And there shall be month after month, and sabbath after sabbath: and all flesh shall come to adore before my face, saith the Lord.'

Isaias lix. 20, 21. 'And there shall come a redeemer to Sion, and to them that return from iniquity in Jacob, saith the Lord. This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.'

Ch. liv. 9–13. 'This thing is to me as in the days of Noe, to whom I swore, that I would no more bring in the waters of Noe upon the earth: so have I sworn not to be angry with thee, and not to rebuke thee. For the mountains shall be moved, and the hills shall tremble: but my mercy shall not depart from thee, and the covenant of my peace shall not be moved: said the Lord that hath mercy on thee.

'O poor little one, tossed with tempest, without all comfort, behold I will lay thy stones in order, and will lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy bulwarks of jasper: and thy gates of graven stones, and all thy borders of desirable stones. All thy children shall be taught of the Lord: and great shall be the peace of thy children.'

Ibid. 17. 'No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper: and every tongue that resisteth thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn. This is the inheritance of the servants of the Lord, and their justice with me, saith the Lord.'

These magnificent prophecies are, of themselves, a sufficient answer to any theory which is based on the assumption that 'the blessings of the Gospel' can be 'forfeited' to the universal Church, or 'the fulness of the presence' of her God within her 'lessened,' or 'abated.'—Though the hills and mountains tremble, yet God's '*mercy shall not depart from her, nor His covenant of peace be moved.*' When God breaks His

oath to Noe, and sin brings back 'the waters of Noe upon the earth;' then, and then only, will He forget or fail in His promise to the Church,—'*I have sworn not to be angry with thee, and not to rebuke thee.*' Then only need we fear for a suspension of her outward unity. He has laid her 'stones in order,' and there shall be no division to displace them.

It is remarkable that the promise to Noe, to which God here appeals in confirmation of His oath to the Christian Church, is expressly grounded on the frailty of man and his liability to evil.—'And the Lord smelled a sweet savour, and said: I will no more curse the earth for the sake of man: for the imagination and thought of man's heart are prone to evil from his youth: therefore I will no more destroy every living soul as I have done.' Genes. viii. 21.

The promises of God to His Church are in like manner independent of human frailty.

Isaias is not the only one who is charged with these glad messages. They have a place amidst the divine strains of the sweet Psalmist of Israel:—

'The mercies of the Lord I will sing for ever. I will shew forth thy truth with my mouth to generation and generation. For thou hast said: Mercy shall be built up for ever in the heavens: thy truth shall be prepared in them. I have made a covenant with my elect, I have sworn to David my servant: Thy seed will I settle for ever. And I will build up thy throne unto generation and generation.' . . . . Psalm lxxxviii. 1-5.

'Then thou spokest in a vision to thy saints, and saidst: I have laid help upon one that is mighty, and have exalted Ib. lxxxviii. 20-38.

one chosen out of my people. I have found David my servant: with my holy oil I have anointed him. For my hand shall help him: and my arm shall strengthen him. The enemy shall have no advantage over him: nor the son of iniquity have power to hurt him. And I will cut down his enemies before his face; and them that hate him I will put to flight. And my truth and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his horn be exalted. And I will set his hand in the sea: and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry out to me: Thou art my father: my God, and the support of my salvation. And I will make him my first-born, high above the kings of the earth.

'I will keep my mercy for him for ever: and my covenant faithful to him. And I will make his seed to endure for evermore: and his throne as the days of heaven. And if his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments: If they profane my justices: and keep not my commandments: I will visit their iniquities with a rod: and their sins with stripes. But my mercy I will not take away from him: nor will I suffer my truth to fail. Neither will I profane my covenant: and the words that proceed from my mouth I will not make void.

'Once have I sworn by my holiness: I will not lie unto David: his seed shall endure for ever. And his throne as the sun before me: and as the moon perfect for ever, and a faithful witness in heaven.'

These promises are abiding.

These promises are to the Christian Church, and they guarantee to us that throughout the whole period of her time-enduring existence, not any 'degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel.' It cannot be denied that amongst those blessings, unity, in all its fulness, outward and inward, visible and invisible, holds a pre-eminent position.

In the verses which follow the above, the inspired

Psalmist bewails the apparent breach of God's covenant; but his words are to be there understood in their primary sense, as applied to the Jewish nation, and the temporal David. It is thus that St. Augustine interprets them, as intended to assure us that the previous promises belong to Christ and to His Church.—'Lest a Christian, who affirmed that these promises were spoken of Christ, should be answered that they referred to David, and he should fall into error if he saw that they all were fulfilled in David; for this reason, He has brought to nought these promises in David, in order that, when you perceive that those things which necessarily must be fulfilled are not fulfilled in him, you may seek another, in whom they may be shown to be fulfilled.'—A little further on he adds: 'Perhaps God was about to say to thee, "I swore indeed and promised, but this one would not persevere." What then, didst not Thou, the Lord God, foreknow that this one would not persevere? Certainly Thou knewest. . . . . It is removed from this David, that it might not be expected in this David. Expect, therefore, that which I have promised.'—Present to the sight of God was the whole course of the Christian Church; foreseen by Him were all the sins of her future children, when He made with her His 'everlasting covenant, the faithful mercies of David.'

In Psalm. lxxxviii. Enarrat. Serm. ii. n. 6.

Isaias, lv. 3.

God has not promised His Church exemption from worldly troubles. 'If his children forsake my law, &c., I will visit their iniquities with a rod: and

The Church is not exempt from affliction.

Heb. xii. 6. Prov. iii. 12. St. John xvi. 33.

their sins with stripes.' We know that 'whom the Lord loveth, He chastiseth;' and Christ has told us:—'In the world you shall have distress: but have confidence, I have overcome the world.'

See above, p. 73. This chastisement is temporal. St. John xix.

Dr. Forbes says:—'The body is mangled, but we believe not severed, through loss of intercommunion.'—Christ's body hung 'mangled' on the cross; yet not 'a bone of Him' was broken. Not one of his blessed limbs or members sustained the 'loss of intercommunion.' His seamless coat was at the mercy of a rude soldiery; yet, as if to show how His providence would protect His Church's unity, not one of them was suffered to divide it, or to rend it.

Cant. Cantic. i. 4. Job x. 22. Cant. Cantic. vi. 3.

The Church is 'black' through afflictions, but always 'beautiful;' and without visible unity there is no beauty, nor can there be any order. The absence of unity and of order denotes the absence of God. It is one of the characteristics of hell. 'A land of misery and darkness, where the shadow of death, and no order, but everlasting horror dwelleth.' Great are the trials, the sufferings, and the afflictions of Christ's Church, but the words of the Spouse shall ever remain divinely true concerning her:—'Thou art beautiful, O my love, sweet and comely as Jerusalem: terrible as an army set in array.' Where would be the terrors of an army which had 'lost its intercommunion'? How could it be sweet and comely, and terrible in its strong array, if its outward unity were suspended? The Spouse Himself declares His beloved to be but One.

'One is my dove, my perfect one is but one, she is the only one of her mother, the chosen of her that bore her.' And, again, he recalls the goodly array of an army terrible in its united ranks:—'Who is she that cometh forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array'? Cant. Cantic. vi. 8. Ibid. 9.

Such is the picture of the Christian Church, as drawn by God's Spirit of truth. Can there be found on earth any communion but one, which corresponds to the delineation? These words find their fulfilment in the Roman Catholic Church alone, and in that one favoured creature, the Church's spotless Queen and type; the ever-blessed Mary; Mother of our God, and of ourselves; who was herself the firstfruits of the redeeming blood of that Son she gave to man.

There are other prophecies which appear to pledge God's word not only to the perpetual fulness of the Gospel blessings, but also that He will Himself preserve His Church from any such 'shortcoming' as might forfeit them. Thus God says by the prophet Osee:—

'I will espouse thee to me for ever: and I will espouse thee to me in justice, and judgment, and in mercy, and in commiserations. And I will espouse thee to me in faith: and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.' Ch. ii. 19, 20.

By the mouth of Ezechiel, He says:—

'I will pour upon you clean water, and you shall be cleansed from all your filthiness, and I will cleanse you Ch. xxxvi. 25–29.

from all your idols. And will give you a new heart, and put a new spirit within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit in the midst of you: and I will cause you to walk in my commandments, and to keep my judgments, and do them. And you shall dwell in the land which I gave to your fathers, and you shall be my people, and I will be your God. And I will save you from all your uncleannesses: and I will call for corn, and will multiply it, and will lay no famine upon you.'

The same prophet foretells also the unity of the Church:—

Ezechiel xxxvii. 22–28.

'I will make them one nation in the land on the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king over them all: and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided any more into two kingdoms. Nor shall they be defiled any more with their idols, nor with their abominations, nor with all their iniquities: and I will save them out of all the places in which they have sinned, and I will cleanse them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God. And my servant David shall be king over them, and they shall have one shepherd: they shall walk in my judgments, and shall keep my commandments, and shall do them. And they shall dwell in the land which I gave to my servant Jacob, wherein your fathers dwelt, and they shall dwell in it, they and their children, and their children's children, for ever: and David my servant shall be their prince for ever. And I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will establish them, and will multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for ever. And my tabernacle shall be with them: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the nations shall know that I am the Lord the sanctifier of Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for ever.'

Ch. xxxix. 29.

'And I will hide my face no more from them, for I have

poured out my spirit upon all the house of Israel, saith the Lord God.'

God's word is not less explicit through the prophet Jeremias :—

'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: As yet shall they say this word in the land of Juda, and in the cities thereof, when I shall bring back their captivity: The Lord bless thee, the beauty of justice, the holy mountain. And Juda and all his cities shall dwell therein together: the husbandmen and they that drive the flocks. For I have inebriated the weary soul: and I have filled every hungry soul. . . . And as I have watched over them, to pluck up, and to throw down, and to scatter, and destroy, and afflict: so will I watch over them, to build up, and to plant them, saith the Lord.' Jerem. xxxi. 23–25. Ibid. 28.

'Behold the days shall come, saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Juda: not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt: the covenant which they made void, and I had dominion over them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord: I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their heart: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying: Know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least of them even to the greatest, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more. Ibid. 31–37.

'Thus saith the Lord, who giveth the sun for the light of the day, the order of the moon and of the stars, for the light of the night: who stirreth up the sea, and the waves thereof roar, the Lord of hosts is his name. If these ordinances shall fail before me, saith the Lord: then also the

seed of Israel shall fail, so as not to be a nation before me for ever.

'Thus saith the Lord: If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I also will cast away all the seed of Israel, for all that they have done, saith the Lord.'

Hom. de Capt. Eutropio. *n.* 6. Hom. ante Exil.

Well might St. John Chrysostom declare that,—'Nothing is stronger than the Church.' 'Nothing is more powerful than the Church.' 'The Church is stronger than heaven itself.' 'The Church is more loved by God than heaven itself.'

Jeremias also foretells, as distinctly as others, the continuity of succession in the house of David, which manifestly must be understood of a spiritual succession, since the temporal has ceased long ago. This is clearly fulfilled in the person of Christ; but in Him it is fulfilled continuously, whereas the prophecy appears to point to a succession of occupants of the throne of David, which can only have its fulfilment in the Supreme Pontiff who sits on the chair of St. Peter, established on Jesus Christ the Son of David, and from which He Himself rules in the person of His Vicar.

Jeremias xxxiii. 14–22.

'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform the good word that I have spoken to the house of Israel, and to the house of Juda. In those days, and at that time, I will make the bud of justice to spring forth unto David, and he shall do judgment and justice in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell securely: and this is the name that they shall call him, The Lord our just one.

'For thus saith the Lord: There shall not be cut off from

David a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall there be cut off from the priests and Levites a man before my face, to offer holocausts, and to burn sacrifices, and to kill victims continually.

'And the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying: Thus saith the Lord: If my covenant with the day can be made void, and my covenant with the night, that there should not be day and night in their season: also my covenant with David my servant may be made void, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the Levites and priests my ministers. As the stars of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea be measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites my ministers.'

Lastly, as if our dear God would still further protect us from the fear that our 'shortcoming' might 'forfeit the blessings of the Gospel,' He puts into the mouth of this prophet also, a direct assurance that He will evermore preserve us from so dire a curse, promising that He will not cease to do His people good, and will never suffer them to revolt from Him:—

'They shall be my people, and I will be their God. And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me all days: and that it may be well with them, and with their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, and will not cease to do them good: and I will give my fear in their heart, that they may not revolt from me. Jeremias xxxii. 38-42.

'And I will rejoice over them, when I shall do them good: and I will plant them in this land in truth, with my whole heart, and with all my soul.

'For thus saith the Lord: as I have brought upon this people all this great evil: so will I bring upon them all the good that I now speak to them.'

God appeals to His past fidelity to His word, which He evinced in punishing His people's sin. Under the old covenant, heavy judgments were foretold and threatened to the Jewish nation as attendant on the breach of God's law. The people broke it and the judgments fell upon them. Under the new covenant, there are still threats of judgment to individual unrepentant sinners, and to individual churches; but there is not the remotest allusion to them as affecting the Universal Church. On the contrary, our God seems never to weary of assuring us that His covenant of peace with us shall be *everlasting*; His sanctuary in the midst of us *for ever*. 'And *I will no more hide My face from them*, for I have poured out My spirit upon all the house of Israel, saith the Lord God.' He appeals to His fidelity to the covenant of justice, in order to increase our confidence in His fidelity to the covenant of mercy. For His 'mercy exalteth itself above judgment.' He tells us that the new covenant shall not be like the old one which our fathers 'made void'; 'but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their heart: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people'; and He adds, that it shall be as sure in its duration as the order of the sun that lights the day, and of the moon and the stars by night.

Vide supra.

St. James ii. 13.

In the fulness of the ages 'our God was seen upon earth,' clothed in our flesh and blood, and ere

'He ascended on high,' and carried our human nature to His throne of glory, He summed up all the long centuries of prophecy, type, and promise, in one sure pledge of His everlasting love :—*Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*

It has been shown that these prophecies included the promises of unity, and of holiness, and that there should never be any cessation of God's benefits :—

'*I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me all days: and that it may be well with them, and with their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, and will not cease to do them good: and I will give my fear in their heart, that they may not revolt from me.*' Vide supra, p. 145.

These promises leave no excuse.

This and much more has He pledged to us: this and much more must be answered, by any who think to plead before the judgment seat of Christ, as an excuse for separation from His visible fold, that man's sin has overcome God's mercy; that 'the fulness' of Christ's presence is 'abated' in His Church; that 'He has not promised to be always present in the same degree and the same way'; and that 'Holy Scripture does not say what degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the gospel.'

The theory tested. Vide supra, p. 74.

Every Christian must agree with Dr. Forbes's exhortation not 'to shape the gospel into a theory that suits us.' Let us then apply the gospel test to the theory now before us. Let us see whether such a theory is compatible with the divine words and the

divine precepts of the gospel; whether it is possible, at one and the same time, to believe the said words, and to maintain the said theory; to act on the said theory, and to obey the said precepts.

The theory is inconsistent with Gospel doctrine. St. John x. 16. See above, pp. 7–14.

The gospel says that 'there shall be one fold and one shepherd'; and Christ's dying prayer is a pledge to us, that such unity can neither be hidden, nor ever fail. The theory declares that this fold has become outwardly divided; with flocks who no longer feed or dwell together, and shepherds who are at disagreement with one another.—For 'one fold and one shepherd,' it points to separated flocks, with separated folds and separated shepherds.

Daniel ii. 44.

The prophet Daniel foretells that Christ's kingdom upon earth 'shall never be destroyed,' . . . 'it shall break in pieces, and shall consume all these kingdoms: and itself shall stand for ever.' Now, a kingdom is a reality; it is visible, and tangible; it implies a head to govern it. Is it replied that the Church is ruled by Christ, invisibly, from above? Be it so: but it requires a visible head to rule a visible kingdom, and to preserve its visible existence. Whereas, according to the theory before us, Christ is represented on earth by many and divided Viceroys, and the people and the rulers who are said to form His one kingdom, are broken up into bodies 'not at one with another' 'even in grave things'; amongst others, 'not at one' even as to the visible church which His subjects are to obey in His Name; 'not at one' as to the constitution of

See extract, p. 73.

their Master's kingdom; 'not at one' as to whether it is true that He elected one chosen Apostle for His Vicar, and ordained that the said Vicariate should always continue, vested in that Apostle's successors; and therefore 'not at one' as to His will concerning men's obedience to the Apostolic See, which many of them fear not to accuse of arrogant presumption. Many more 'grave things' there are, as will be shown, on which Christian Bishops and Christian peoples are, evidently, 'not at one with one another.' If these all belong to one king; if these all make up one kingdom; it must be to a king whose commands may be interpreted after the varying pleasure of His diverse subjects; it must be a kingdom whose members are 'not at one with another'! What is this, in other words, but a kingdom divided against itself?

How then shall the prophecy be fulfilled? How then shall Christ's kingdom 'stand for ever'? Three of the gospels repeat His own solemn words:—'Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate: and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand.'—'If a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand.'—'Every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation, and house upon house shall fall.'—Which alternative is to be accepted? The word of God, or the theory of man? God has said that 'every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate' and 'cannot stand': yet that Christ's

St. Matt. xii. 25.

St. Mark iii. 24, 25.

St. Luke xi. 17.

kingdom 'shall stand for ever.' If both these words of the eternal Truth, be true, then that theory must be false which assumes, that Christ's kingdom can be divided; its rulers and people, 'even in grave things, not at one with one another'; its 'unhappy divisions' such, 'that we cannot meet, even to heal them.'

Vid. sup. pp. 73, 74.

Such divisions are inconsistent with the gospel picture of the Church, nor can it be wrested into a shape to suit the theory that these visibly divided bodies still are inwardly one in Christ.

St. Matt. xvi. 18.

Christ has promised that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church.' What are the 'gates of hell' but sins, and heresies, and schisms; 'divisions and want of love'? These have their place outside, they appertain not to Christ's kingdom. They may find insidious entrance into the hearts of individuals within His fold, but they never shall prevail within her, or against her, so that 'the fulness' of her Lord's 'Presence' should thereby become 'abated.'

The theory is inconsistent with Gospel precepts.

But more,—there are precepts of the gospel, which, if this theory were true, it would be utterly impossible to obey.

St. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

Christ sent forth His Apostles, saying:—'Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.' Christ taught to His disciples:—'If thy brother will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.' When He sent forth the gospel messengers, He told them:—'He that

St. Matt. xviii. 17.

St. Luke x. 16.

heareth you, heareth Me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. And he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me.'

St. Paul accordingly admonishes us,—'Remember your prelates who have spoken the word of God to you: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation, Jesus Christ yesterday, and to-day: and the same for ever. Be not led away with various and strange doctrines.' . . . 'Obey your prelates and be subject to them.'—At the same time, He, elsewhere, cautions us most emphatically, 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema.'

Heb. xiii. 7–9.

Ibid. 17.

Gal. i. 8, 9.

Now, by what means are we to discern between 'another gospel,' which is 'anathema,' and 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' which 'he that believeth not shall be condemned'? Clearly, through the teaching of Christ in that one Church which legitimately represents to us the college of the Apostles, to which he confided that great deposit; and which St. Paul declares to be 'the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.' It is admitted, on all sides, that the Roman Catholic Church belongs to this Church of Christ, although Anglicans claim the same privilege for the national Church of England. They do not call in question the apostolical descent of the Roman Catholic Bishops, though

1 Tim. iii. 15.

they maintain that the Church of England possesses a like succession. The theory maintains that Rome and England are one in Christ. But these two societies teach opposite doctrines on vital points. How then is the true faith to be ascertained? How are we to distinguish it from 'various and strange doctrines'? If it is replied that the points of difference are not vital, I answer that the Roman Catholic Church teaches that they are so, and that this variation, of itself, constitutes a discrepancy which is vital.

According to this theory of inward unity under outward division, it is impossible for any man now to 'hear the Church.' How can we hearken in true obedience to the Church in communion with Rome, and at the same time listen dutifully to a community which renounces her allegiance? The Roman Catholic Church asserts that to her alone the gospel message is committed; that she speaks with Divine authority, as the true and only representative of those who were sent forth by Christ 'into the whole world, to preach the gospel to every creature,' with the warning that 'he that believeth not shall be condemned.' England denies her exclusive mission, refuses to bow to her authority, and disbelieves her testimony to the gospel message. I repeat that, if both these communions form part of the one Church of God, it has now become impossible for any man to 'hear the Church' in obedience to the commands of Christ. This is enough to prove the falsehood of the theory, for God never commands impossibilities.

Again,—if the Archbishop of Westminster and the Archbishop of Canterbury are, both of them, prelates in the one church (though outwardly differing), it follows that every English Christian is bound in conscience to follow 'the faith' of them both, to 'obey' them both, and to 'be subject to' them both. If not, he is disobedient to the voice of God through St. Paul. But no man can serve two masters, or be subject to two prelates whose commands are in direct opposition to each other. No man can follow the faith of those who are at variance respecting the faith. If both churches are one in Christ, then the Prelates of both speak equally in the name of Christ, Who said:—'He that heareth you, heareth Me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me.' How, then, shall we escape 'despising' Him who is our All, if both these messengers are from Him? How are we to 'hear' Westminster without 'despising' Canterbury? How listen to Canterbury without 'despising' Westminster? Nay, Anglicans acknowledge Rome, at least as their Patriarchal See, yet they refuse to 'hear' its Bishop; and the majority of their communion who visit the city, 'despise' the voice of its Pontiff; acting as if the great centre of Christendom were, for them, a mere portion of the diocese of Gibraltar. If it be replied that Rome has no title to the position which she claims, what is this but to 'despise' the voice of the Roman Catholic Bishops throughout the world, whose divine commission is nevertheless acknowledged?

These are practical questions, and the gospel is a practical religion; and not only practical, but practicable. How will this theory teach men to obey it?

Is this the gospel of peace, waited for with the expectancy of long and weary ages, by Saints, and Seers, and Sages of all time? This, the fulfilment of God's sure and universal promises?—

Isaias xxx. 20. 'Thy eyes shall see thy teacher.'—'The work of
Ibid. xxxii. 17, 18. justice shall be peace, and the service of justice quietness, and security for ever. And My people shall sit in the beauty of peace, and in the tabernacles of confidence, and in wealthy rest.'—When compared with such a prophecy, is not the theory plainly 'another gospel'? Hear again the prophet Ezechiel:—'I will feed them in the mountains of Israel,
Ezech. xxxiv. 13, 14, 15. by the rivers, and in all the habitations of the land: I will feed them in the most fruitful pastures, and their pastures shall be in the high mountains of Israel: there shall they rest on the green grass, and be fed in fat pastures upon the mountains of Israel. I will feed My sheep: and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God.'

Ibid. 23, 24. 'And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God: and My servant David the prince in the midst of them: I the Lord have spoken it.'

Neither the prophets nor the gospel tell of an outwardly divided Church. Let us accept their divine teaching with the simplicity of children.

Differences respecting faith.

The theory in question affirms that, in spite of their serious divisions, the three principal religious communions of Christendom still are inwardly one in the faith. Dr. Forbes says:—'We bear separate witness still to the One Faith which Christ gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds; we all look to Him as truly present in His Sacraments, truly giving His own Body and Blood; we all hold to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, teaching those same truths which they taught, and holding sacred the descent from them.'

See extract above, p. 73.

It is a painful necessity when a wound must be probed. Still, in a case of life or death, the operation is preferable to self-deception. When God's truth is concerned, He wills not that men should delude themselves or one another, by the cry of 'Peace, Peace,' where in His sight no peace exists. It is with the differences between England and Rome that we are most immediately and practically concerned, and it would be a false charity to shrink from exposing either their nature or their extent. Far be it from me to widen the division or to add fuel to the fire of strife, but a deadly wound cannot be healed by concealment, nor are hindrances to reconciliation removed by being ignored.

It is true that in one sense, the difficulties are less than they are often imagined to be. For, if the teaching of Rome were rightly understood, it would commend itself to all true Christian hearts, and, so far from deterring, it would draw them to her fold. Yet it is a fallacy and a delusion to suppose that England

Difference as to the ground of faith.

and Rome are inwardly united in one faith. They are at variance not only respecting the articles of the faith, but also, as to the actual foundation of the faith; as to the ground on which mankind are to accept the Scriptures, and the Creeds, and the whole of the Divine revelation,—the whole of Christianity.

Roman Catholics accept it all on the ever-living ever-present, testimony of the Church of God; of that Church whose infallibility Anglicans assert to be suspended. Here, at the commencement, is an irreconcilable discrepancy on a subject which lies at the root of the whole Christian life.

Romans x. 14, 15.

St. Paul asks how men are to believe without having heard? And how hear 'without a preacher?' 'And how shall they preach unless they be sent?'

Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Ch. I.

Every Catholic child is authoritatively taught in his Catechism that faith is 'to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed'; and that we are to know what God has revealed, 'by the testimony and authority of the Catholic Church, which Christ has appointed to teach all nations.' Here then is the preacher sent by Christ Himself, without whom, as St. Paul tells us, we cannot even hear God's truth, and therefore cannot possibly believe it to salvation. Thus far, it may be, both sides are agreed. But there remains the essential question:—Where at this moment is to be found this authorized preacher of Christ's gospel? Where is now the voice of the Catholic Church? On this point Rome and England are divided, and the difference is insuperable. The Catechism I have just quoted, and whose exclusive

use is enjoined by authority for English Catholics, thus instructs us on the subject:—

Q. What is the Catholic Church? Ninth Article of the Creed.

A. The union of all the faithful under one Head.

Q. Who is that Head?

A. Christ Jesus our Lord.

Q. Has not the Church a visible head on earth?

A. Yes; the Bishop of Rome, who is the Vicar of Christ.

Q. Why is the Bishop of Rome the head of the Church?

A. Because he is the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ appointed to be the head of the Church.

Q. How do you prove that Christ appointed St. Peter to be the head of the Church?

A. Because he said to him: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

Q. What is the Bishop of Rome called?

A. He is called the Pope, which word signifies Father.

Q. Is then the Pope our spiritual Father?

A. Yes; he is the spiritual Father of all the faithful.

This is Rome's formal faith respecting the constitution of the Catholic Church. Is it true that the 'Church of England' bears 'separate witness' to this same faith? Does she accept the above as a true description whereby to discern, in this nineteenth century, the one exclusive Church of Christ? From that Church alone can we learn God's revelation. Therefore, if we differ as to the essential marks by which that Church must be recognised, or as to the infallibility of her present voice, we differ as to the very ground of all Christian belief,—we differ as to the channel through which, at this present moment,

'the faith once delivered to the saints' is divinely explained to man. How can they be one in the faith, who are at variance respecting the teacher of the faith?

It is asserted by Anglicans that the Church, in which men are to believe, has lost her power of speech, or that her language is now rendered incoherent, through external division. Amongst Roman Catholics it is taught to be of faith, that the Church is always visibly united, under the visible rule of the Roman Pontiff; and that she is now, as ever, our audible teacher, our infallible guide in faith and in morals. The former hold that, for the present, her voice is suspended; that each man must gather her teaching from memories long since past, as seems right in his own eyes; and that her 'unhappy divisions' are such, 'that we cannot meet, even to heal them.' The latter believe in her constant outward unity, and constant unerring voice.

Thus Rome and England are at variance as to the foundation of the whole Christian faith. Are they agreed as to its individual Articles?

Ubi supra. Dr. Forbes says:—'We bear separate witness still to the one faith which Christ gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds.' Now, such witness cannot be given without mutual agreement respecting the full sense of the Creeds. Mere outward agreement in the *words* of the Creeds may exist without agreement as to their meaning, or as to the faith which they express. Thus the Creed of the Apostles is explained by the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian; and no one can be said to bear witness to the faith of the first,

unless he cordially accept the two latter as one with it. Is it then true that Rome and England are agreed as to 'the faith of the Creeds'? It can be only one faith. Is it a fact that they 'bear separate witness' to it as such? Do they interpret those Creeds alike?

The large latitude which exists in the 'Church of England' renders it difficult to define her teaching very precisely. At the same time, there are certain salient points of difference, which render clear and apparent the vital separation that exists in matters of doctrine, between herself and the Roman Catholic Church, whose faith is definite and marked, and is professed with no uncertain voice.

The following declarations, as to certain articles of the Roman faith, are taken from sources whose authority cannot be called in question. They form a portion of her formal and dogmatic teaching, and I shall not hesitate to give them at greater length than, perhaps, may seem absolutely necessary, in order that they may be the better understood. I begin with the authoritative Profession of Faith sometimes called the Creed of Pope Pius IV. After reciting the Nicene Creed, which, amongst other articles, professes belief in 'One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,' it proceeds as follows :—

'I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

'I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church hath held and doth hold, to whom it belongeth to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take

and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

'I also profess that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony: and that they confer grace: and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order cannot be repeated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

'I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

'I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calleth Transubstantiation. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.

'I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

'Likewise, that the Saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

'I most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

'I also affirm that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

'I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

'I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church hath condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

'I, *N. N.*, do at this present freely profess and sincerely hold to this true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved: and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, by God's assistance, to the end of my life.'

The Supreme Pontiff.

Now, if England really bore witness to this faith, and taught this doctrine to be the true sense of the Creeds, there would be no need of further argument. If her members will but accept it, and render the true obedience here promised to the Vicar of Jesus Christ in the person of the Roman Pontiff, the separation will be at end. If not, how can it be asserted that such separation is merely outward?

The Sacraments.

To pass on. Do Rome and England 'bear separate witness' to one faith respecting the Sacraments?

Baptism.

The grace of Baptism is now, practically, an open question in the Church of England. Therefore, whatever may have been her witness formerly to that article of the Creed, it is for the present at any rate suspended.

Confirmation.

I know not how the Church of England bears witness that Confirmation is a Sacrament, 'instituted by Jesus Christ.' In any case she has grievously mutilated the manner of its administration. Though retaining an imposition of hands and a form of prayer, she has wholly rejected the signing on the forehead with chrism, which is commonly taught to be essential to the matter of the Sacrament; and she has altered the form of words, which, with the Greeks, is—*Signaculum doni Spiritus Sancti*; and with the Latins—*I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

Catech. Trident. P. II. c. 3.

This is that Holy Chrism, which, it has been said, was delivered to the Apostles by Christ Himself; and which, in each diocese, His representative, the Bishop, blesses every year with mysterious and impressive rites during the Mass of Maundy Thursday. It is composed of oil and balsam, and can be blessed on no other day. The oil for the sick is previously blessed in the same Mass; but the chrism immediately after the Communion. Twelve priests assist the Bishop, six on either hand, representing the Apostles. Behind him are seven deacons, in memory of the seven they ordained; and behind these, seven sub-deacons, as ministers. This sacred chrism is used in all solemn consecrations, and receives peculiar reverence as a special emblem of God the Holy Ghost. St. Augustine terms Confirmation, the Sacrament of Chrism.

Acts vi.

Cont. litt. Petil. Lib. ii. n. 239.

The Holy Eucharist.

The above-cited Profession of Faith is explicit on the doctrine of the Eucharist. God be praised, there may be many Anglicans now who will not on that account turn away, as did the unbelieving disciples in the gospel. But how does their Church as a body, bear witness to this article of the faith? As a rule, is it not contradicted by her authorities, at least in its fulness, though there may be happy exceptions? May it not, in general, be denied by her clergy with greater impunity than it can be maintained?

Penance.

God again be praised, that so many hearts in the Church of England are awakened and awakening to the unspeakable blessings of auricular confession, and the importance of priestly absolution! But where is her authoritative testimony to the *divine* institution of the blessed Sacrament of Penance; and to the absolute *necessity* for the fallen to have recourse to it in order to obtain the remission of their mortal sins? Is this maintained or taught, even by any of those who are laudably foremost in the advocacy of its use? If so, it must be from their own conviction; it cannot in any sense be said that the 'Church of England' bears witness to this essential portion of the faith, or is at one with Rome in her belief respecting it. The Council of Trent enunciated, as follows, the formal doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject, which is of supreme importance to man's salvation:—

Session xiv. ch. 2. Waterworth's Translation, p. 94.

'This sacrament of Penance is, for those who have fallen after baptism, necessary unto salvation; as baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated.'

Session xiv. Canon I. Ibid. p. 107.

'If any one saith, that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after baptism; let him be anathema.'

Session xiv. Canon VI. Ibid. p. 108.

'If any one denieth, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of divine right; or saith, that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church hath ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention; let him be anathema.'

If this be the faith of the Church of England, how awful is the guilt of her silence!

Extreme Unction.

It manifestly cannot be asserted that the Church of England bears any kind of witness to the same faith with Rome respecting the blessed Sacrament of Extreme Unction: which was instituted by our merciful Lord to convey help and spiritual support to the sick in the hours of their decisive trial; to heal and strengthen their souls; to fortify them against the assaults of Satan in their last agony; or to restore them to bodily health if God should see it expedient.

The holy Council of Trent, after treating of the Sacrament of Penance, proceeds to instruct the faithful respecting that of Extreme Unction, upon which subject I extract the decrees in full:—

Session xiv. Waterworth's Translation, pp. 104–107.

'ON THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

'It hath also seemed good to the holy Synod, to subjoin, to the preceding doctrine on Penance, the following on the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which by the Fathers was regarded as being the completion (*consummativum*), not only of penance, but also of the whole Christian life, which

ought to be a perpetual penance. First, therefore, as regards its institution. It declares and teaches, that our most gracious Redeemer,—who would have His servants at all times provided with salutary remedies against all the weapons of all their enemies,—as, in the other sacraments, He prepared the greatest aids, whereby, during life, Christians may preserve themselves whole from every more grievous spiritual evil, so did He guard the close of life, by the sacrament of Extreme Unction, as with a most firm defence. For though *our adversary* seeks and seizes opportunities, all our life long, to be able in any way *to devour* our souls; yet is there no time wherein he strains more vehemently all the powers of his craft to ruin us utterly, and, if he can possibly, to make us fall even from trust in the mercy of God, than when he perceives the end of our life to be at hand.'

CHAPTER I.

ON THE INSTITUTION OF THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

'Now, this sacred unction of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord, as truly and properly a sacrament of the new law, insinuated indeed in Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle, and brother of the Lord. *Is any man*, he saith, *sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* In which words, as the Church has learned from apostolic tradition, received from hand to hand, he teaches the matter, the form, the proper minister, and the effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church has understood the matter thereof to be oil blessed by a Bishop. For the unction very aptly represents the grace of the Holy Ghost, with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed; and furthermore, that those words, "By this unction," &c. &c., are the form.'

St. James v. 14, 15.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE EFFECT OF THIS SACRAMENT.

'Moreover, the thing signified (*res*) and the effect of this sacrament are explained in those words; *And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him.* For the thing here signified is the grace of the Holy Ghost; whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins; *and raises up* and strengthens the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him a great confidence in the Divine mercy; whereby the sick being supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness; and more readily resists the tempta-
Gen. iii. 15. tions of the devil, who *lies in wait for his heel*; and at times obtains bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of the soul.'

CHAPTER III.

ON THE MINISTER OF THIS SACRAMENT, AND ON THE TIME WHEN IT SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED.

'And now as to prescribing who ought to receive, and who to administer, this sacrament,—this also was not obscurely delivered in the words above cited. For it is there also shown, that the proper ministers of this sacrament are the *Presbyters of the Church*; by which name are to be understood, in that place, not the elders by age, or the foremost in dignity amongst the people, but, either bishops,
1 Tim. iv. 14. or priests by bishops rightly ordained *by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood.* It is also declared, that this unction is to be applied to the sick, but to those especially who lie in such danger as to seem to be about to depart this life; whence also it is called the sacrament of the departing. And if the sick should, after having received this unction, recover, they may again be aided by the succour of this sacrament, when they fall into another like danger of death. Wherefore, they are on no account to be hearkened to, who, against so manifest and clear a sentence

(*sententiam*) of the Apostle James, teach, either that this unction is a human figment or is a rite received from the Fathers, which neither has a command from God, nor a promise of grace: nor those who assert that it has already ceased, as though it were only to be referred to the grace of healing in the primitive church; nor those who say that the rite and usage which the holy Roman Church observes in the administration of this sacrament is repugnant to the sentiment of the Apostle James, and that it is therefore to be changed into some other: nor, finally, those who affirm that this Extreme Unction may without sin be contemned by the faithful: for all these things are most manifestly at variance with the perspicuous words of so great an apostle. Neither, assuredly, does the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all other churches, observe aught in administering this unction,—as regards those things which constitute the substance of this sacrament,—but what blessed James has prescribed. Nor indeed can there be contempt of so great a sacrament without a heinous sin, and an injury to the Holy Ghost Himself. These are the things which this holy Œcumenical Synod professes and teaches and proposes to all the faithful of Christ, to be believed and held, touching the sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction. And it delivers the following canons to be inviolably preserved; and condemns and anathematizes those who assert what is contrary thereto.'

Two of the canons here referred to, respecting Penance, have already been given. I subjoin the three first of those which regard Extreme Unction:—

'CANON I.—If any one saith, that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James; but is only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human figment; let him be anathema.' Ibid. pp. 110, 111.

'CANON II.—If any one saith, that the sacred unction

of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor comfort (*alleviare, raise up*) the sick; but that it has already ceased, as though it were of old only the grace of working cures; let him be anathema.'

'CANON III.—If any one saith, that the right and usage of Extreme Unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is repugnant to the sentiment of the blessed apostle James, and that it is therefore to be changed, and may, without sin, be contemned by Christians; let him be anathema.'

Eirenicon, pp. 22, 219, &c.

Dr. Pusey appears to think that there is no ground, 'except the custom of the Church, why Extreme Unction should not be used in England.' It is perfectly certain, as has been before observed, that there is no single point on which the Roman doctrine on any subject, need create a difficulty amongst earnest-minded and religious men, if only it were rightly understood. But as things are and have been for the last three centuries, it certainly cannot be maintained that the Church of England has borne any sort of witness to the same faith as that of Rome respecting this holy sacrament; and, if she believes in it at all, it is inconceivable how she can have so systematically withheld it from her members.

Explanations.

This leads to a digression, which I hope will not be thought unseasonable. An opportunity for explanation should never be allowed to escape; and the remarks upon this subject in the 'Eirenicon,' expressly invite an explanation.

Object of Extreme Unction.

Eirenicon, p. 223.

First, I ask permission to correct the error into which the learned author of that work has fallen when he says, that 'the Roman Church practically

looks upon Extreme Unction as a mere preparation for death.'

The practice of the Roman Church is at one with her doctrine. The teaching of the Council of Trent has been already stated. Pope Eugenius IV. also instructed the Armenians, at the Council of Florence, that the effects of Extreme Unction were—'the healing of the mind; and, so far as it is expedient, of the body itself also.—*Effectus vero est mentis sanatio; et, in quantum autem expedit, ipsius etiam corporis.*

Hardouin, Acta Concil. Tom. ix. col. 440.

The first provincial council of Cologne (A.D. 1536), after treating of the other sacraments, says:—'There remains Extreme Unction, which (since in death there is the last conflict) is applied, that either the sick may recover, if God see fit, or in faith and good hope may fall asleep in the Lord.'

Pars vii. cap. 49, Hardouin ix. col. 2011.

Hugo of St. Victor writes respecting it:—'First, the soul is cured, then the body is healed. The body is sick for the correction of the soul. Therefore, in order to obtain the health of the body, the soul must first be cured. And if, perchance, the body is not re-established in its former vigour, there is no danger if only the soul shall have received its health.'

De Sacramentis, Lib. II. Pars xv. 3. He died A.D. 1140.

The Roman Ritual teaches as follows:—

'The Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which was instituted by Christ our Lord, as a celestial medicine, for the health (*salutaris*) not only of the soul, but also of the body, is with all zeal and diligence to be applied to those who are dangerously sick; and, indeed, if possible, at that time when their mind and reason are still in full vigour: so that, in order to their fuller reception of the

Rituale Romanum, De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis.

grace of the sacrament, they may also on their part contribute faith, and the pious will of the mind, whilst they are anointed with the holy oil.'

Extreme Unction can never be given to anyone whose life is endangered otherwise than by sickness, as it would be if 'practically looked upon as a mere preparation for death.' I subjoin the teaching of the Tridentine Catechism on this point, and as to the proper time for its administration:—

P. II. chap. vi. 'The faithful are to be taught that, although this sacrament appertains to all, certain classes of persons are excepted, to whom it is not to be administered. And in the first place are excepted persons in sound health; for that to them Extreme Unction is not to be given, the Apostle also teaches, when he says: "Is any one sick among you?" and reason shows, for it was instituted to be medicinal not only to the soul, but also to the body. As, then, those only that labour under disease have occasion for cure, so also this sacrament ought to be administered to those who seem to be so dangerously ill that it may be feared lest their last day of life should be near. Those, however, sin very grievously (*gravissime*—a word which denotes *mortal* sin) who are wont to observe that time of anointing a sick person when, all hope of recovery having been already lost, he is beginning to grow dead and senseless; for it is obvious that it avails very much to a more abundant reception of the grace of the sacrament, if the sick man be anointed with the sacred oil whilst the mind and reason are still in vigour, and he can bring to its reception faith and the religious will of the mind. Wherefore, parish priests must take care to apply this heavenly medicine, by its own power at all times most salutary, then especially when they see that its efficacy will also be increased by the piety and devotion of those to whom it is to be administered.

St. James v. 14.

'To no one, therefore, who is not visited by grievous sick-

ness, is it lawful to give the sacrament of Unction, even though he is about to incur risk of life; either by undertaking a perilous voyage, or by engaging in battle from which certain death may impend over him, or even though, condemned to capital punishment, he should be hurried off to execution. Furthermore, all who want the use of reason, are not fit to receive this sacrament; nor are children, who are not guilty of any sins, from the remains of which they would have occasion to be healed by the remedial efficacy of this sacrament; nor yet idiots nor madmen, unless they have sometimes the use of reason, and then in particular give signs of piety, and ask to be anointed with the sacred oil. For a person who, from his very birth, never had the use of his mind and reason, is not to be anointed; but if the sick person, whilst yet in sound mind, wished to be made a partaker of this sacrament, and subsequently became insane and delirious, he is to be anointed.'

Cardinal Bellarmine's teaching is the same:—

Explanation of Christian Doctrine, revised and approved by the Ven. Congregation of the Reform.

'Many,' he says, 'fall into a great error, in not wishing to receive this Sacrament till the moment of their passing away; but the proper time to take it is when the physicians judge the malady to be dangerous, and when human remedies do not appear to be sufficient; and therefore recourse is then had to heavenly remedies, and so, not seldom it happens that the sick person is healed by means of the holy oil. Therefore this holy sacrament should not be asked for, when we are not in danger of death, nor yet ought it to be postponed till there is no more any hope. And this is the reason why the holy oil is not given to those who are about to be executed, because such persons are not sick, nor have they any hope of life.'

The matter of the Sacrament is oil (which must be from olives only) blessed by a bishop. This blessing is given with ceremonial and great solemnity during the mass of Maundy Thursday, the bishop

leaving the altar for the purpose between the consecration and communion. The Roman (Tridentine) Catechism observes, concerning the holy oil :—

Part II. chapter vi.

'This matter most aptly signifies that which is effected inwardly in the soul by virtue of the Sacrament. For as oil is very efficacious in mitigating bodily pain, so does the virtue of this Sacrament alleviate the sadness and anguish of the soul. Oil also restores health, brings cheerfulness, and affords, as it were, food to light; whilst it is also very well calculated to restore the strength of a wearied body. All which things declare the effects produced in the sick person by divine power through the administration of this Sacrament.'

The form of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction consists in the following prayer, which is repeated at the anointing of each organ of the senses:— 'Through this holy unction ✠ and through His most loving mercy, may the Lord forgive (or indulge) thee (*indulgeat tibi*) whereinsoever thou hast trespassed (*quidquid deliquisti*) by sight, hearing, &c. &c.'— These words breathe more than the mere forgiveness of the guilt of sin; they imply a fulness of merciful indulgence.

The Roman Catechism observes that the deprecatory form is intimated by St. James, and thus explains it :—

Ubi supra.

'Nor let anyone be surprised that, whilst the form of the other sacraments either absolutely signifies what the sacrament effects, as when we say, "I baptize thee;" or "I sign thee with the sign of the cross;" or is pronounced, as it were, by way of command, as when, in administering the Sacrament of Order, it is said, "Receive power;" this

form alone of Extreme Unction is accomplished by a certain prayer. For with very good reason has that been ordained; for since this sacrament is administered, in order that, besides the spiritual grace which it imparts, it may also restore health to the sick; yet because it does not always follow that the sick recover from their illness, therefore does the form consist of a prayer in order that we may obtain from the goodness of God that which the virtue of the sacrament is not wont to effect in a constant and continual order. Peculiar rites, however, are employed in the administration of this sacrament also, but the chief part of them contains prayers which the priest uses to obtain health for the sick person. For there is no other sacrament which is accomplished (*conficiatur*) with more prayers; and with reason, for at that time most especially are the faithful to be assisted by pious prayers. Therefore also all others who may happen to be then present, and particularly parish priests, ought to pray to God with all their heart, and with all earnestness to commend to the divine mercy the life and salvation of the sufferer.'

In the Roman Ritual, immediately after the order for administering Extreme Unction, there follow the seven penitential psalms with the litanies, under the heading—'For the sick, whilst they are being anointed with the sacred oil, or for other necessity.'

I have dwelt at some length on the special prominence given to prayer in connection with Extreme Unction, because it tends to explain certain passages in which its effects appear to be attributed to the prayer, apart from the anointing. But, just as the term 'holy oil,' which is only the *matter* of the sacrament, is frequently used to express the sacrament itself, without mention of the prayer which is its

essential *form*, so it may easily happen that the single word *oratio* is likewise employed at times, as sufficiently designating the whole of the Sacrament.[1] Thus St. James, in his Epistle, seems to use the expression in this sense; and the Roman Catechism also, in the following exhortation to faith and confidence:—

Ch. v. 15.

Ubi supra.

'Let parish priests strive to persuade the sick man to offer himself to the priest to be anointed, with that faith with which of old those who were to be healed by the Apostles were wont to offer themselves. But first there is to be sought the salvation of the soul, then the health of the body, with this adjunct, if it should be profitable for eternal glory. Nor indeed ought the faithful to doubt, that those holy and solemn prayers are heard by God, which are used by the priest, not in his own person, but in that of the Church, and of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Two, if not all, of the three following collects, used after the anointing, pray expressly for the healing of the body:—

Rituale Romanum, Ordo Extrem. Unct.

'Lord God Almighty, who hast spoken by thine Apostle James, saying: "Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over

[1] In a note at p. 226 of the 'Eirenicon,' the following quotation is given from 'a catena' to show, that, 'in Victor, the efficacy is ascribed' to the prayer':—'The oil, then, wherewith one is anointed, signifies both the mercy from God and the healing of the disease, and the illumining of the heart. *For that prayer worketh all is plain to everyone; but the oil is the symbol of these things.*' The passage is from the Catena Aurea of St. Thomas Aquinas on St. Mark vi. 13, and it is there attributed to St. John Chrysostom; but critics say it is from Victor of Antioch. I subjoin the original:—'Significat autem oleum unctionis Dei misericordiam, infirmitatis medelam, et cordis illuminationem; *quod totum oratio operatur.*' The word *oratio* is evidently here used for the whole Sacrament. The italics are my own.

him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him:" cure, we beseech thee, O our Redeemer, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, the languors of this sick man; heal his wounds, and forgive his sins: drive out from him all pains of mind and body, and mercifully restore to him full health, inwardly and outwardly, that, being recovered by the help of thy mercy, he may return to his former duties. Who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.'

'Regard, we beseech thee, O Lord, thy servant, N. exhausted under the infirmity of his body, and revive the soul which thou hast created; that being amended by chastisements, he may perceive himself to be saved by thy remedy. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.'

'O holy Lord, Almighty Father, eternal God, who, by infusing the grace of thy blessing into sick bodies, dost preserve, by thy manifold goodness, the work of thy hands, graciously be present at the invocation of thy name, that, delivering thy servant from sickness, and bestowing health upon him, thou mayst raise him up by thy right hand, strengthen him by thy might, defend him by thy power, and restore him to thy Holy Church, with all desired prosperity. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.'

It is, then, evident, that the healing of the body, when God sees fit, is prominently regarded as one of the effects of Extreme Unction. But undoubtedly, as with all the sacraments, its primary end is spiritual; nor can the words of St. James be restricted to the body. It is a healing balm for all spiritual wounds; a celestial cordial for all spiritual languors. In the words of our English Catechism:—'It com- Chapter vi.

forts the soul in her last agony, it remits sin, and also restores health when God sees it to be expedient.'

Practice of the Church.

Eirenicon, p. 219.

The Church's practice accords with her teaching. Her working clergy could produce instances in abundance, resembling the one quoted on the authority of a Russian Priest of a man raised up three times from dangerous illness by means of Extreme Unction.

Postponement of the Sacraments.

The Church, as may be seen above, urgently exhorts her children not to postpone the reception of Extreme Unction to the last moment of their lives. But we all know how often sick men will not own themselves in danger; and how the false kindness of friends conceals from them their peril, and shrinks from calling their attention to the necessity of preparation, whether as to their spiritual or even their temporal concerns. Thus, if the sacraments are too often delayed till the end, it is not through the fault of the Church or of her ministers, but it arises from the human weakness of so many of her individual children. Nor is this reluctance to contemplate the approach of death by any means peculiar to Catholics.

Custom previous to the Council of Trent.

Eiren. p. 22

The 'Eirenicon' refers to an 'abuse before the Council of Trent, when Extreme Unction was customarily administered to those only, of whom there was a moral certainty that they could not recover; and, if they should recover, it was a question whether it should be again administered to them when they should again be sick.'

The 'Eirenicon' does not imply that this abuse

was in any way sanctioned by authority; but it may be questioned how far it had become 'customary' excepting with the ignorant. Certainly it would be manifestly contrary to the mind of the Church. It may be seen above how strongly it is condemned in the Roman Catechism; and the afore-cited decree of Pope Eugenius IV., a century before the Council of Trent, expressly taught, that the proper subject for extreme unction is 'a sick person for whose death there is apprehension (*de cujus morte timetur*).'

Hard. Acta Concil. t. ix. col. 440.

But, it is undoubtedly a fact, that the abuse of putting off this sacrament to the last, was too common at one time, amongst the more ignorant of the people. Benedict XIV. observes, that but a slight knowledge of ecclesiastical history will suffice to show, that the evil custom of putting off Extreme Unction till the very point of death, arose out of a false notion which pervaded Great Britain in the 13th century, that a sick person who recovered after receiving it, must afterwards lead a life of entire continence, even if married; and must never more eat flesh meat, or walk with naked feet (perhaps out of respect for the holy oil with which the feet had been anointed). He says elsewhere that this foolish idea seized upon many minds. It was productive of great evil; leading ignorant persons to postpone, and incur a risk of altogether losing, the Sacrament of Extreme Unction; as is stated in the decrees of the Synods of Worcester (*an.* 1240) and Exeter (*an.* 1287), both of which condemn the error as heresy. They speak also of

Instit. Ecclesiast. No. xxii.

De Synod. Diœces. Lib. viii. cap. 7.

Hard. Acta Concil. tom. vii. col. 337 and 1081.

the twofold end of this sacrament, both for soul and body; and the last-named Synod further enjoins on parish priests to instruct their people that it may lawfully be repeated. Directions against the same error are found also in the Constitutions of Richard, Bishop of Salisbury, A.D. 1217. Later, there arose a foolish notion, that no one could make a will after having received Extreme Unction. This was condemned by a Belgian Synod, at Malines, A.D. 1607.

Quoted by Bened. XIV. in loco citato.

Hard. Acta Concil. tom. x. col. 1746.

De Synod. Diœces. Ubi supra.

'In our own age,' adds Benedict XIV., 'the faithful are free from these prejudices, but nevertheless the enemy of man has instilled the notion into many ignorant and uncultivated minds, that there is an end of this life for any one who is anointed, and that the tomb alone remains for him.' He then shows that one effect of the sacrament is to heal the body as well as the soul, if God sees it expedient; and concludes:—'Therefore the end of life, when he is now breathing his last, is not to be waited for for the anointing of the sick: for the sacrament does not work this effect by way of miracle, as would be necessary under those circumstances, but by a certain virtue—supernatural it is true, but in some sense ordinary—which assists the natural causes.'

Sum. Theol. Pars. III. Tit. 14, cap. viii. He died A.D. 1459.

St. Antoninus taught:—'This sacrament (of Extreme Unction), when devoutly received, increases grace, which is the health of the soul; nay, it also sometimes removes the sickness of the body, gradually restoring its strength, when indeed it is decreed for any one to recover from sickness, and if such be profitable for the

salvation of his soul, which is principally to be sought for. But even if it should be decreed that they should die, yet death is not hastened by receiving this sacrament, as is thought by some foolish people. Nor ought it to be deferred till the last, when understanding and devotion are no longer possible.'

This is one with the doctrine of our own day. Thus, Father Perrone teaches, that, although Extreme Unction is for the grievously sick alone, it is not meant that it should be postponed till the very last. 'Such mode of acting,' he adds, 'is against the mind of the church, and contrary to the secondary end of the sacrament, which is to confer health, if expedient to the salvation of the soul. For since this sacrament does not produce this effect by way of miracle, it ought not to be deferred till a miracle may be necessary.'

Prælect. Theolog. de Extrem. Unct. cap. ii. 43. Ed. 31ma Taur. et Mediol. 1866.

Benedict XIV. says that, towards the end of the eleventh and early part of the twelfth century, and even later, some were of opinion that Extreme Unction could not be repeated. On the other hand, there were those who thought that it might be repeated even during one and the same state of danger from illness. Sardagna, however, observes that it is uncertain whether the repetitions in question were not merely ceremonial. However this may be, Benedict XIV. states also that the usually received and approved doctrine was that which was afterwards infallibly confirmed by the Council of Trent—viz.

The doctrine on the repetition of this Sacrament. De Synod. Diœces. Lib. viii. cap. 8. iii.

Theol. Dogm.-Polem. De Extrem. Unct. No. 395.

that Extreme Unction can be repeated if the sick should recover after receiving it, on the recurrence of 'another like danger of death.' The instruction in the Roman Ritual interprets this by the direction, that it cannot be repeated in the same illness unless it be one of long duration, in which the sick person after recovery shall relapse into danger of death.

De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis.

The manner in which the subject was discussed by Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, shows that in his day (the twelfth century) there was a degree of doubt upon it (arising from a fear of disrespect to the sacrament). But he says that Extreme Unction 'is repeated often in nearly all the Church (*in omni pene Ecclesiâ sæpe repetitur*).' In the thirteenth century, St. Thomas taught precisely the same doctrine on this point as that which the Church confirmed at Trent in the sixteenth. He says:—

IV. Lib. Sentent. Dist. xxiii.

'No sacramental, or sacrament which has perpetual effect, ought to be repeated, because thus it would appear that the sacrament was not of sufficient efficacy for that end, and so a wrong would be done to that sacrament. But a sacrament which has an effect which is not perpetual, may be repeated without wrong to it, that the effect which is lost may be recovered by its repetition: and since the health of body and mind (*sanitas corporis et mentis*), which are the effects of this sacrament, may be lost after they have been wrought by the sacrament, therefore this sacrament may be repeated without any wrong to itself.'

3tiæ partis supplement. q. xxxiii. In 4 Lib. Sentent. dist. xxiii. q. ii. art. 4.

Again he says:—

'This sacrament does not regard the sickness alone, but also the state of the sickness, because it ought only to be given to those sick persons, who, according to human

Ibid.

judgment, appear to be drawing near to death. For some sicknesses are not lingering; so that if the sacrament is given in these cases, at the time that the person arrives at a state when he is in danger of death, he does not leave that state unless the sickness is cured, and so he ought not again to be anointed: but if he should suffer a relapse, it will be another attack of the sickness, and there can be another anointing. But some sicknesses are of long duration, as hectic fevers, and dropsy, and others of this sort; and in such diseases the unction should only be made when they appear to bring on danger of death; and if the person passes that point while the same sickness lasts, and is again reduced to a similar state by that sickness, he can again be anointed, because it is, as it were, another state of sickness, although it is not simply another sickness.'

Such was the doctrine of the Angelic Doctor; and it was that also of St. Bonaventure, styled the Seraphic Doctor, and of others; three centuries before the Council of Trent.

Sins remitted by Extreme Unction.

Eirenicon, pp. 223-227.

The 'Eirenicon' very reasonably asks for an explanation of the dogma that Extreme Unction 'remits sins;' it being a sacrament for persons in a state of grace, and not being 'given to remit venial sin.' Bellarmine also is quoted to show that theologians differ as to what is intended by 'remains of sin.'

Explanation.

Now the Canon defines that Extreme Unction remits sins, but it does not say, deadly sins; nor that the remission of sins, either venial or mortal, is the primary object for which it is given. All that is of faith is, that remission of sins is one of the effects of Extreme Unction. There is no question that a conscious state of mortal guilt is an obstacle to its

graces. But it is commonly taught that it will remit even mortal sin in one invincibly ignorant of it, and otherwise properly disposed; or in one become incapable of any moral act, provided that, at the moment when he lost his mental faculties, he possessed that imperfect contrition which, *under such circumstances*, would suffice for this sacrament, but of itself, be insufficient for justification. It is unnecessary to discuss whether, under the pressure of sickness or mortal agony, even 'one of well-instructed conscience' might not be invincibly ignorant of a state of mortal sin. For many dying persons who receive the sacraments are, unhappily, without the habits of a well-instructed conscience.

Eiren. p. 224.

It is true that opinions differ as to how far such guilt appertains to the 'remains of sin,' and as to the mode in which the sacrament of Extreme Unction remits it; but this difference does not regard the dogma. Such points, says Benedict XIV., *curiose magis, quam utiliter, investigant Scholastici.*

De Synod. Diœces. lib. viii. cap. 7.

The Roman Ritual expressly refuses Extreme Unction 'to the impenitent, to those who die in manifest mortal sin, to the excommunicated, and to the unbaptized.' 'Nothing,' says the Tridentine Catechism, 'is more opposed to the grace of this sacrament than the consciousness of any mortal sin.' Accordingly, if possible, it is invariably preceded by sacramental confession and absolution; and, by present custom, the Holy Eucharist is also previously administered. But these sacraments may have been defectively received; the sick man may have un-

Part ii. chap. 6.

consciously failed in the requisite dispositions; or, through culpable ignorance, or even knowingly, he may have concealed some mortal sin, thus adding guilt to guilt. Or, strong temptation may have betrayed him into some mortal sin of thought, even after a good confession and communion. He may have subsequently lost his reason before he has made a sign; but not before God's watchful mercy has aroused him (if only through the fear of judgment) to some degree of sorrow, together with hope of pardon, and resolution not to sin again. In short, his dispositions in themselves may be insufficient for justification, but such as to become sufficient through the grace of the sacrament. In which cases Extreme Unction remits guilt, supplies defects, and rescues the immortal soul from the jaws, as it were, of hell.

Again, a man's reason may fail utterly, or be suspended by delirium. An unforeseen accident or sudden fit may paralyze the senses and take away all consciousness. No confession can be made nor wish for absolution manifested. Eternity is at the door and mortal guilt is on the soul. But that same grace of attrition may have been in the heart when the moral action ceased; and if God has seen it there, Extreme Unction will remit the guilt. Such is the case referred to, as follows, by Pope Benedict XIV.:—

'It is to be presumed of every one of the faithful, concerning whom the contrary is not manifest, that he would have sought this sacrament if he could. All, as it seems to us, should be fortified with Extreme Unction, who, being

De Synod. Dioces. lib. viii. cap. vi. 6.

oppressed by the sudden force of disease, are deprived of their senses, and unable to signify any desire for the sacrament; and those especially whose known piety and faith afford an evident argument of their desire, which they would signify if they could. This practice indeed is approved by St. Thomas, all the Rituals, &c., &c., and St. Charles Borromeo.—Nay, Suarez observes that it is most necessary to assist such a sick person, deprived of his senses and incapable of the other sacraments, with the remedy of Extreme Unction: "Because," he says, "one of the principal ends of this sacrament is to supply the place of the Sacrament of Penance, either when that cannot be applied, or when, in fact, it is not applied with sufficient utility." On this account many theologians permit a priest to interrupt mass, in order to administer Extreme Unction to a sick person near to death, to whom no other sacrament could be given; because in such case, by Extreme Unction alone, if he have sufficient attrition, he can obtain the first grace of justification, which it is possible he may stand in need of.'

Instruct. Extr. Unct.

P. 2, De Sacramentis, Disp. 42, § 1.

St. James v. 15.

It should be observed, that the words of the Tridentine decree, like those of St. James, are conditional:—'If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.'

Remains of sin.

Theologians commonly understand by the 'remains of sin,' in the first place, the evil effects which sins have wrought upon the soul; such as mental languor, torpor, sadness, over-anxiety, trouble of conscience, blindness and deadness to spiritual things, dread of the world to come, weakness and inability to raise the mind to heaven, distrust of God, despondency, and the like; which are wont to oppress, and disturb, and enervate the spirit, and tempt the soul to despair, especially at the approach of death.

St. Alphonsus Liguori says:—'Baptism and Penance differ from Extreme Unction, inasmuch as they are instituted principally to blot out actual or original sin; but Extreme Unction (as St. Thomas teaches) is instituted principally to remove the remains of sins—namely, the debility and infirmity which remain from actual sin; but because the remains cannot be removed when sin is found in the soul unless the sin be first removed, therefore, as a consequence (*ex consequenti*), this sacrament takes away sin.'

Theol. Moral. lib. vi. Tract V. No. 731.

Father Perrone explains the meaning of the term 'remains of sin,' as follows:—'By this name is understood that languor and infirmity of the mental faculties, by which we are drawn away from doing right, and from the pursuit of virtue; as well as that perverse and preposterous inclination of the will, through which we have a propensity for vice, and are impelled, as it were by a kind of pressure, to the gratification of our passions. But the more hurtful this twofold affection of the mind, which is contracted from a multitude of sins, the more ought it to be healed by a seasonable remedy; especially when, being afflicted by grievous disease, there impends over us the danger of the loss of life. For we very much fear to die; and this fear is increased both by the consciousness of our past life, and by our anxiety and reflection concerning the dreadful judgment of God, shortly after to be undergone. Therefore, lest the mind should be overwhelmed with these fears, and that it may the rather expect death

Prælect. Theolog. De Extrem. Unct. cap. ii. 45. Note 3, Editio citata.

with tranquillity, it ought to be encouraged and raised up, filled with a certain pious and holy joy, and freed from the remains of sin.'

In lib. iv. Sent. Dist. xxiii. Q. 1, Art. 2. 3tiæ partis supplem. q. xxx.

St. Thomas says, that, 'as baptism is a certain spiritual regeneration, and penance a certain spiritual resuscitation, so extreme unction is a certain spiritual healing or medication (*quædam spiritualis sanatio, vel medicatio*);' and that, 'the principal effect of this sacrament is the remission of sins as regards the remains of sin, and, by way of consequence, as regards the guilt also, if it should find it.'

It is important, however, to observe that it is not intended that the evil habits, engendered by past sins, are in such sense removed and taken away by Extreme Unction, as that the sick person, if he recover, need not fear any relapse into them; it is not (as has been explained by Sardagna) that this sacrament works any change in the natural habit and disposition of the body; but that it gives strength and vigour against the evil, and the remains of sin are taken away, inasmuch as the Holy Unction heals and gladdens and fortifies the soul, rendering it strong under its own weakness. It does not destroy existing habits, nor afford security against a relapse into evil practices; but it gives strength to overcome those habits and the difficulties and temptations which arise from them in the last decisive struggle.

Theol. Dogm. Polem. De Sacram. Extrem. Unct. No. 398.

In lib. iv. Sentent. Dist. xxiii. Q. 1, Art. 2. 3tiæ partis supplem. q. xxx.

Thus, St. Thomas adds:—'Dispositions remaining from acts, which are certain commenced habits, are not what are here called remains of sin, but a certain

spiritual debility existing in the mind itself, on the removal of which the mind cannot so easily be inclined to sins, even by the same habits and dispositions that remain.'

Bellarmine and some others understand, also, by 'remains of sin,' any actual sins which may remain after other sacraments, or be otherwise found upon the soul as previously explained, and which Extreme Unction (if received in proper dispositions) will remove, being, 'as it were, the complement of the Sacrament of Penance.' But this is simply a question of terms, since it is of faith that this sacrament 'remits sins,' whether considered as 'remains of sin' or not. Father Perrone says, that theologians everywhere teach that it remits venial sins *per se*; but deadly sins *secundario* or *per accidens*. He observes that it may 'truly be called, as it were, a medium between the sacraments of the living and the dead.'

St. Charles Borromeo, Instruct. Extrem. Unct.

In loc. cit. n. 2.

Ibidem, 49, ad fin.

The Roman Catechism thus beautifully explains the effects of Extreme Unction:—

Effects of Extreme Unction.

'Pastors therefore will teach that by this sacrament is imparted grace that remits sins, and especially indeed lighter, or as they are commonly called, venial sins. For mortal sins are removed by the Sacrament of Penance; nor was this sacrament instituted primarily for the remission of heavier crimes; but only Baptism and Penance effect this by their proper power (*vi sua*).

Catech. Conc. Trid. Pars II. cap. vi.

'Another advantage of the Sacred Unction is, that it liberates the soul from the languor and infirmity which it contracted through sins, and from all the other remains of sin. But the time to be considered most opportune for this cure is when we are afflicted with severe illness, and

danger to life impends. For it has been implanted by nature in man to dread no human visitation so much as death. But the recollection of our past sins greatly augments this dread, especially when the most poignant accusation of our conscience goads us; for, as it is written—"They shall come with fear at the thought of their sins, and their iniquities shall stand against them to convict them." Another source of vehement anguish is the anxious thought that we must soon after stand before the judgment seat of God, who will pass on us a sentence of strictest justice according to our deserts. It often happens that, struck with this terror, the faithful feel themselves wonderfully agitated. But nothing conduces more to a tranquil death than to cast off sadness, and await with a joyous mind the coming of our Lord, and to be ready willingly to surrender our deposit whensoever it shall be His will to demand it back. To free the minds of the faithful from this solicitude, and to fill the soul with pious and holy joy, is then an effect of the sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Wisdom iv. 20.

'From it, moreover, we derive another advantage, which may justly be deemed the greatest of all. For although the enemy of the human race never ceases, whilst we live, to meditate our ruin and destruction, yet at no time does he more violently strain every nerve utterly to destroy us, and, if possible, deprive us of hope of Divine mercy, than when he sees the last day of life approach. Therefore are arms and strength supplied to the faithful through this sacrament by which they may be enabled both to break the violence and impetuosity of the adversary, and to fight bravely against him. For the spirit of the sick person is relieved and encouraged by the hope of the Divine goodness, strengthened by which he bears more lightly all the inconveniences of sickness, and eludes with greater ease the artifice and cunning of the devil, who lies in wait for his "heel."

Gen. iii. 15.

'Finally, the recovery of health, if indeed advantageous, is another effect of this sacrament. However, should

the sick not recover it in these days, that is to be attributed, not to any defect of the sacrament, but rather to the weaker faith of a great part of those who are anointed with the sacred oil, or by whom it is administered. For the Evangelist bears witness that the Lord "wrought not many miracles" amongst His own, "because of their unbelief." Although it may also be said with reason that the Christian religion, since it has struck its roots as it were more deeply in the minds of men, stands now less in need of the aid of miracles of this kind, than would seem to have been formerly necessary at the commencement of the rising Church. But, nevertheless, faith is here to be strongly excited; for, however it shall happen by God's counsel and will with regard to the health of the body, the faithful ought to rely on a sure hope of attaining, by virtue of this sacred oil, spiritual health; and of experiencing, should the hour of their departure from life be at hand, the fruit of that glorious assurance, by which it is written: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord!"'

St. Matt. xiii. 58.

Apoc. xiv. 13.

St. Charles Borromeo teaches as follows:—

'The first benefit and effect of this sacrament is that it takes away the remains of sin, as if the complement of the Sacrament of Penance. Which remains are understood to be sins, whether mortal or venial, which remain after other sacraments; for it may happen that mortal sin may remain, the one who committed it being in ignorance of it, or not being able to confess; in blotting out which he is so assisted by this sacrament, that it may come to pass that a man is saved through this sacrament, who otherwise would have been damned.

Acta Eccles. Mediol. p. iv. Instruct. Extrem. Unct.

'These remains are also torpor, grief, and a certain anxiety which is left from sin, and afflicts a man when close to death.

'There are many things besides which, in various ways, afflict a sick man; both the natural fear of death, and the

dread of God's judgment by which he is exceedingly alarmed, and the power of the disease, which so depresses him that at times he cannot take up the thoughts of God and of divine and heavenly things, and of the salvation of his soul. And it sometimes happens that, harassed by the disease, he is impelled hither and thither by some trifle, now to complainings, now to suspicions, now to impatience, and to other like perverse affections which hurt his soul.

'Against all these inconveniences also, this sacrament avails as a most wholesome medicine, and it is divinely endowed with power to enable the sufferer to bear them more easily.

'Another advantage of it is that, when the devil, who has learnt by daily practice the condition, the natural disposition, and the habits of the sick man, attacks him variously in all manner of ways in that his last hour, in order that he may distract him, disturb him by desperation, and despondency of mind, or exalt him with too much presumption and a certain elation; the sick person receives through this sacrament supplies of divine strength, which enable him boldly to resist the adversary.

'And, as it strengthens the soul against the enemy, so also, when profitable for the soul, it sometimes heals the body.'

The same holy bishop thus beautifully explains the matter and form of this sacrament:—

In loco citato.

'The organs of the senses are anointed with oil, because the soul is filled with the grace of the Holy Ghost, which is commonly signified by oil, in order that sins and the remains of sins may be wiped away, and the soul raised up and strengthened.

'A form which contains a prayer is added, since St. James said, *Let them pray over them*, &c. And since this sacrament is a kind of complement of penance, and the sick, especially

at that time, cannot do works of penance, they expect remission from mercy only, which is implored by prayer.

'The cross also is impressed when the anointing with the sacred oil is administered, in order that we may know that these gifts are granted to us through the merits of the cross and passion of the Lord; and that we may fortify our senses with that sign, and use it in the combat to be sustained against the adversary; and also that we may carry the sign of the cross to the tribunal of Christ our Judge, by which we may show that we have fought under the standard of the cross constantly even unto death.'

Suarez on Extreme Unction. De Sacramentis Pars 2da, Disp. xli. 1. Vide supra, pp. 164–167.

These pages would be incomplete without mention of the very clear teaching of the *eximius doctor*, Suarez. Resting on the spiritual sense of the words of St. James, and on the decrees of the Council of Trent, he says that Extreme Unction was instituted, *primarily*, to comfort and assist the souls of the sick against the difficulties which beset the hour of death, as wrestlers are anointed for the combat. He calls it the Sacrament of Hope, because it especially strengthens that virtue; he says that it also promotes cheerfulness, heals and fortifies the soul, and gives promptitude and vigour to overcome the temptations of the devil, then most grievous. He says that, *secondarily*, it was instituted to prepare the soul for glory, for which the removal of sin is most necessary. Therefore, that it will remit even mortal sin (where it finds the proper dispositions), not *per se*, as Baptism and Penance; nor yet altogether *per accidens*, as is probable with other sacraments, but because so intended by the Institutor under such circumstances.

The conditional form, '*If he be in sins*, they shall be forgiven him,' shows that their remission was not intended to be the primary end of the sacrament; whilst the promise of forgiveness if sin be there, renders it evident that such remission is in some way peculiar to it, and in some way intended in its institution. He observes (in a previous paragraph), that the conditional '*if*' indicates that this remission extends to mortal as well as venial sins, since hardly anyone can be found without the latter.—'Herein,' he adds, 'is very greatly magnified the prudence and the anxiety of Christ our Lord concerning the everlasting salvation of mankind; for since eternity depends upon that moment, and a loss then incurred concerning eternal salvation is irreparable, and from many causes it may happen that either other remedies cannot be applied, or certainly that they may be applied without effect, therefore to this last remedy He imparted a virtue of its own (*propriam*) to supply this defect, and to rescue man when placed in so great peril.'

He says that Extreme Unction remits also the temporal punishment due to sin, not always entirely, as Baptism, but according to the disposition and devotion of the recipient. Also, that it removes other remains of sin; not that it takes away the *fomes*, or the evil habits, or the effects on the imagination, or changes the natural disposition of the body; but it gives strength and vigour, and in this way is instituted against the weakness left by sin,

not by removing it in itself, as it removes guilt or temporal punishment, but by adding more force to overcome it. 'It may also be said,' he continues, 'that it remits these remains, so far as, on account of his sin, it was due to the man to be left to his own frailty and weakness, and to be deprived of the helps of grace, especially of extraordinary and superabundant helps. This debt of sin is so discharged through this sacrament that, on account of it, these helps are the rather due to the man, to fortify him against such remains when he falls into that state of sickness.' He teaches that this grace belongs to the primary end of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, and that no other sacrament is ordained to convey it, since it is reserved for 'the special necessity and weakness of one who is sick.'

Subsequently he treats of the restoration of bodily health, when God sees fit, as another effect of Extreme Unction. Ubi supra, sect. 4.

It is a sacrament of special mercy.

Thus does this holy sacrament heal and sustain the soul, and, when expedient, bring back health to the body also. Thus does it wipe out any remaining guilt, if it finds the necessary sorrow. Thus does it bring grace to prevent relapse into sin, and to turn the sorest temptation into a source of highest triumph. Nay more—it wins for the sufferer merit and everlasting glory, even out of his past transgressions; by enabling him to overcome their bad effects, to hold on, and to fight his way to heaven, through the throng of phantasms and foul imaginations which

rise up around him from their remains, like mists from the pit of hell. It inspires him with acts of the opposite virtues and of earnest hope in God—gems to adorn his future crown. So ingenious is the love of the Divine heart of Jesus, in repairing our losses, and increasing our reward—*Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus: quoniam in sæculum misericordia ejus!*

Ps. cxvii.

Father Faber. The Creator and the creature, p. 304.

It has been beautifully said:—'Death too, with its unknown necessities, must have a sacrament which it can call its own, as well to finish the demolition of sin, as to anoint the failing warrior with a heavenly unguent for his last dire combat, and enable him, in defiance of earthly calculations, to elude the hold which the unseen powers of evil lay upon him in that hour. If we ever need help, will it not be in that dreadful agony, for neither earthly love nor earthly power can help us then? With many, doubtless, the battle has gone hard, though they who stood around neither heard nor saw the mortal wrestle; and with many it was the secret strength of that holy oil, the hidden operation of that sacramental grace, which turned the scale, and consigned to the Good Shepherd's arm that sheep which is now His own for ever.'

Lukewarmness respecting this Sacrament.

These, then, are the benefits of this most blessed sacrament of Extreme Unction. Who that believes in them, and is mindful of his last end, would not yearn for its Divine support in those moments of his agony when all support from man is failing fast, and

when Satan is near 'having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time?' Yet even the pious author of the 'Eirenicon' expresses no desire for it; he is neither 'cold nor hot' towards it; he thinks there need be no objection to it; and, in comparing Rome with England in this particular, he observes, that 'the only real difference is mainly practical in regard to the anointing of the sick.' But this practical difference involves the omission of a sacrament which sustains and perfects the just in their perseverance, and of which St. Charles Borromeo and others have affirmed, that a penitent sinner, in ignorance of his state of guilt, or not then able to confess, is by it 'so assisted in blotting out mortal sin, that it may come to pass that one is saved through this sacrament who would otherwise be damned.'

Eiren. p. 219.

Vide supra.

It is observed in the 'Eirenicon' that, if Extreme Unction be 'looked upon as a mere preparation for death, not as a means, if God so will, of restoring the sick, one does not see what there can be lacking to our dying,' if we have the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. Its author would never have said this if he had been one in the faith with Rome. It is true that Penance is ordained to absolve from sin, and that the Holy Eucharist contains the very fount and centre of all those graces, of which the other sacraments are the channels. But, even when both these sacraments have been received with the most perfect dispositions, who that believes what has been stated respecting that of Extreme Unction

Eiren. p. 223.

Difference as to faith.

can at the same time question how it is lacking, for soul as well as body? Every sacrament has a spiritual end, peculiar to itself. They who believe that their Divine Redeemer mercifully instituted this one for their hour of greatest need, cannot neglect the gift without neglecting Him who gave it. It is one of the streams which flow from Calvary—one of the channels of His most precious Blood. It is one of the sacraments of the New Law, and the Council of Trent has pronounced 'anathema' against any who deny it to have been 'instituted by Christ our Lord.' Did He institute it to be laid aside, as if superfluous?

God's mercy never fails.

The mercy of our God and Saviour abides with us to the last. In the hour of death, as all through life, is the 'angel of His presence' ever near to save us. Well may the great Apostle call out, 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?' How shall men answer it before the judgment-seat of Christ, if they show themselves content to forfeit the aid of such a sacrament, which He has Himself ordained and purchased for them? In the days of helpless infancy, His 'everlasting arms' enfold us; and He makes us His by the grace of Holy Baptism ere yet our reason dawns. And when our reason's light is failing, and our senses waxing dim, and death seems near at hand, again 'the everlasting arms' embrace us; again they sustain our second childhood's weakness, through the holy sacrament of our anointing. All through our life they have been 'underneath' us;

Isaias lxiii. 9.

Heb. ii. 3.

Deut. xxxiii. 27.

He has 'carried us and lifted us up all our days'; and now in our last moments He 'is the same.' This sacrament fulfils and completes His promise,—'I have made you, and I will bear. I will carry and will save.' Again and again have Christ's sacraments restored, and quickened, and sustained us; but now, when our lifelong penance may be drawing to its close, and we seem close upon the threshold of 'the house of our eternity;' then in a more special manner our God draws near us, and His divine grace fortifies us in this sacrament of healing and of strengthening and of His own loving consummation of our imperfect penance. Our Jesus thus assists us that He may not lose our dearly-purchased souls; and that we may not lose our crown, then so close within our reach, if only we surmount that severest of our trials, on which depends—ETERNITY!

Is. lxiii. 9.
Is. xlvi. 4.
Ibid.
Eccles. xii. 5.

Can any Christian believe in this, who has it not, and yet say, without emotion, that he sees not what is lacking to his dying?

Rome is man's true Mother.

In the city of Rome, when (death seeming to be near) the Holy Unction has been given, the priest leaves behind him his stole on the bed of the sick person; and there it remains till the end, be it recovery, or be it the world to come. Thus is the sufferer cheered in his struggle, and taught to confide in the nearness of Christ, and in His love:—'Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evils, for Thou art with me. Thy rod and thy staff, they have comforted me. Thou hast

Psalm xxii.

prepared a table before me, against them that afflict me. Thou hast anointed my head with oil; and my chalice, which inebriateth me, how goodly is it!'

Which is it of the two—is it England or is it Rome—which proves herself man's mother in his hours of direst need? If England is of one faith with Rome as regards this sacrament, how can she explain or justify its three centuries' systematic cessation? Would not such neglect show contempt for it?

Holy Orders.

In reference to the sacrament of Holy Orders:—if England was of one faith with Rome, she would hardly remain so regardless of the fact already referred to, that Rome (who believes the repetition of Ordination to be a sacrilege) never fails unconditionally to ordain all Anglican clergy who come back to her, and who are admitted to her ministry. Thus Rome practically denies that the 'Church of England' possesses this sacrament.

Matrimony.

If the Established Church of England really believed, with Rome, that a true, ratified, and consummated Christian marriage is indissoluble, it is hardly credible that she would take so little pains to preserve her members from the iniquities of a Divorce Court. Had she believed such divorce a sin and had she acted as if she believed it, that Court could never have become established, when it did. But, after all, the Divorce Court was based on no principle that was new to her. She had already con-

sented to such divorces, and had invoked God's blessing on the subsequent so-called marriages of the divorced with other persons, whenever the civil power allowed it. The recent Act contained nothing new in principle, but it extended the existing evil, and gave a greater facility for the sin which had already been sanctioned. Thus, as regards the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony, again the two religions are found at variance.

Indulgences. See above, p. 161.

To pass on.—If England believes with Rome 'that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people'; why does she so neglect them? She makes no such provision for relieving penitent sinners from the temporal punishment still due after the eternal is remitted. She takes no pains to remove misunderstanding concerning them.

Purgatory.

Again:—if the national Church of England 'constantly holds,' with Rome, 'that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful,' how comes it that she has no express and formal public prayers in their behalf? How comes it that, if such prayers are said at all, it is on sufferance? She takes no pains to recommend them; she hardly dares avow them.

Invocation of Saints.

So also, as to the Communion of Saints. If England believes with Rome respecting it, how comes she to be

so remiss as never even to exhort her children to have recourse to the powerful intercession of the Saints who reign together with Christ?

Neglect of these means of grace.

Truly, if England's faith in all these portions of the creed still lives, her charity must be dead; she bears no witness to it in her works; she neglects these several means of grace; she never leads her perishing flocks to these many streams of living waters. Does she not scare them from drawing near?

Faith respecting the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Where is England's separate witness to the one faith, as regards that sinless one, the most favoured and most exalted of all favoured and sublime creatures; her, whom all generations of the faithful hail as Blessed? England is not at one with Rome, nor with the great St. Austin, when he says:—'For the honour of the Lord, I will have no question at all entertained concerning the Holy Virgin Mary, when there is any discussion about sins.' *Exceptâ itaque sanctâ virgine Mariâ, de quâ propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus cùm de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæstionem.*

De natura et gratia, cap. xxxvi. n. 42.

The Immaculate Conception.

Scarce twenty years have fled, since the letters of the Roman Pontiff went forth over the whole earth, asking the testimony of every Bishop as to the traditionary faith of his own particular diocese, respecting the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary:—Whether for one single moment, the great Mother of our God and Saviour had been under Satan's thraldom?—Whether there was ever one single instant, during which her blessed soul was defiled with Adam's sin?

The universal globe made answer; and the Supreme Pontiff, aided by the light of God, discerned the 'mind of Christ,' the divinely appointed moment, and the movement of the Holy Ghost.

1 Cor. ii. 16.

A vast assembly is convened at Rome, and around the great Apostle's earthly resting-place large multitudes are thronging into the noblest of God's temples. The solemn but joyful rites commence, and in measured cadence there swells up from that crowd of Christian men as if they had one only voice, the cry for aid from Heaven—'Veni Creator Spiritus.' It ceases, and all is still. Then arises in the strength of the Lord God, as if filled with that blessed Spirit, the holy and august Pontiff of old Rome, and he proclaims to the universe, by a power not his own, that after prayers and fastings, and earnest supplications from himself and the Church to Almighty God through Jesus Christ His Son, he now, assisted by the Holy Ghost, declares, that:—

Litt. Apost. de Dogmat. Defin. Imm Conc. Virg. Deip.

'To the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, to the dignity and glory of the Virgin Mother of God, to the exaltation of the Catholic Faith, and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and Our Own, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which maintains that the most blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception was, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in consideration of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of the human race, preserved

exempt from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God, and therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any, which may God avert, shall presume to entertain in their hearts an opinion at variance with this doctrine which we define, be it known to such persons, and let them moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck concerning the faith, and have fallen off from the unity of the Church. . .

'Therefore, let no man infringe upon this our declaration, publication, and definition, or with rash daring oppose and contradict it. But if any one shall presume to attempt it, be it known to him that he will incur the indignation of the Omnipotent God, and of the blessed Peter and Paul, His Apostles.'

The Pontiff ceased, and the gorgeous vaults re-echoed with the *Te Deum* of thanksgiving from the thousands who were gathered under that stupendous dome. The strain was caught up outside; it was borne on throughout the universe; and the pure angelic vaults of heaven re-echoed the joy of Christian hearts below, that none amongst them now could have a doubt that God's Mother was Immaculate; that their own Mother, Mary, was always without a stain.

What part has the so-called 'Church of England' taken in this triumphant hymn of praise resounding throughout all space? How has she borne her 'separate witness' to this article of the one faith?

Nay, what testimony does she give at all to the filial love and veneration due to Mary, which nature itself should teach to all who believe in their heart that of her 'was born Jesus,' and that Jesus is their God?

Importance of these considerations.

These are not idle questions; nor is it any idle motive which has induced me to explain these differences so fully. My object is to dispel the mischievous delusion which is raising a mist before the eyes of so many earnest Christians, and cheating into rest those who are in a position of schism and of heresy. I do not seek by these expressions to give offence, but I wish to call things what they are. I have shown, from authorities whose testimony cannot be questioned, the doctrine which Rome teaches to be the faith on the points which have been mentioned. She teaches it as the one only faith; the faith of the Apostles, 'once delivered to the saints.' She teaches it as the original revelation of the eternal God of Truth, through Christ 'the light of the world,' and through the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. She teaches that there is no salvation for those who wilfully reject this faith. If England accepts it, then why does she remain apart? Would not this alone be schism? If England rejects it, then in what sense can it be said that 'we bear separate witness still to the one faith which Christ gave to His Church, the faith of the creeds'?

The theory proved to be false.

I am prepared for the reply. It will be said that the points to which England objects are additions to

the one faith; that they are not true explanations, but alterations of the creeds. Such an answer shows at once how fallacious is the theory of an imaginary objective unity, invisibly existing, through Christ the unseen Head. Can those be one in Christ, who are divided as to the interpretation of the articles of the saving faith which Christ revealed and taught?

On this point I rejoice to be able to appeal to the testimony of Dr. Pusey. In his explanation of the theory before us, he teaches that it maintains unity of faith to be essential. He says distinctly,—'*They* have not the same Lord, who do not believe the same truth as to Him'; and he shows that he intends by this, more than the faith respecting His Divine Person, since he refers to the Pelagians as not believing 'in what He wrought for us, and the Donatists' as denying 'the existence of that mystical body, whereof He was the Head.'

Eiren. pp. 53-56.

He proceeds:—'The faith, St. Paul says, is one, one unchangeable faith, admitting neither of enlargement nor diminution, so that either what the Apostles believed and taught the whole Church as faith, should cease to be faith, or that anything should become faith which they, full of the Holy Ghost, knew not and taught not as the faith. But since the faith is one, one whole, then whosoever parteth with, or altereth any portion of the one faith, in fact changes the whole, so that it is not the same faith, whence the stress in the Athanasian Creed on "keeping the faith whole and undefiled."' He includes among those things which 'if any wilfully reject, they reject

Christ.' 'one common faith, that which was given once for all, with the anathema that we hold no doctrine at variance with it, although an angel from heaven were to preach it.'

Dr. Forbes asserts the same. He says that 'objective unity' 'requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which Christ gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church.' Vide sup. p. 70.

It has been seen that Rome teaches, as a portion of the faith, that Christ committed to the Apostle Peter, and his successors, the charge of the whole 'flock of God,' with supreme authority over the Universal Church; and that every baptized Christian owes 'true obedience to the Bishop of Rome' as 'Vicar of Jesus Christ.' England rejects this portion of the faith, and will not acknowledge this commission. What then becomes of unity between the two?

It has been shown further that, in other respects also, either Rome has added to the faith, or England has taken away from it. So that, according to the 'Eirenicon' itself, either one or the other has 'changed the whole faith,' and both 'cannot have the same Lord, who do not believe the same truth as to Him.'

Which of the two is right? Has England 'rejected Christ'? Or is Rome 'at variance with the faith'? Is there no one left on earth to teach infallibly what that one faith is, which 'Christ committed to the Church;' which 'the Apostles believed and taught;' and 'out of which no one can be saved'?

The Sacraments may exist outside Christ's Church.

It is perfectly true as regards individual Christians that baptism made them one in Christ. On this very ground, as has been already stated, the one only Church lays claim to them all as her children. By whomsoever they may have been baptized, the Roman Catholic Church alone is the Church of their baptism and their spiritual Mother.

See above, pp. 15, 16.

De Bapt. contra Donatistas, Lib. iv. n. 1.

I venture to add another extract to those I have already produced from the works of that great Doctor, St. Augustine, on this subject. In reference to a passage in an Epistle of St. Cyprian's, he observes:—'The comparison of the Church to Paradise is an indication to us that men can truly receive her baptism even outside her, but no man can either obtain or hold fast beatific salvation (*salutem beatitudinis*) outside her. For the rivers also from the fountain of Paradise flowed largely even outside it, as Scripture testifies. In fact, they are commemorated by name, and every one knows what lands they flow through, and that their streams have been established outside Paradise; yet neither in Mesopotamia nor in Egypt, whither those rivers reach, is there the felicity of life which is remembered in Paradise. Thus it comes to pass, that, though the water of Paradise is outside Paradise, still there is no beatitude excepting it be inside Paradise. So then, there may be the Baptism of the Church outside the Church, but the gift of a blessed life is nowhere found unless inside the Church (*sic ergo baptismus Ecclesiæ potest esse extra Ecclesiam, munus*

autem beatæ vitæ non nisi intra Ecclesiam reperitur) : which also is founded on the rock, which has received the keys of binding and of loosing.'

The theory says that England and Rome are united in the faith and the holy sacraments. It has been above shown that the facts on both sides contradict it. But, even if England possessed the fulness of the faith, and the entirety of the sacraments; even this would afford no guarantee that she was united with the one Church. On this point also we have the authority of St. Augustine, who says that everything, except salvation, may be found outside the Church. The following passage, though frequently quoted, has never yet been answered:—'A man may have everything outside the Catholic Church, except salvation. He may have honour, he may have sacraments, he may sing Alleluia, he may answer Amen, he may hold the gospels, he may both have the faith and preach it in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but, nowhere except in the Catholic Church, will he be able to find salvation. For all these things pass away, my brethren.' *Extra Ecclesiam Catholicam totum potest præter salutem. Potest habere honorem, potest habere sacramentum, potest cantare Halleluia, potest respondere Amen, potest Evangelium tenere, potest in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti fidem et habere et prædicare: sed nusquam nisi in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ salutem poterit invenire. Transeunt enim omnia ista, fratres mei*

S. Aug. Sermo ad Cæsareens. Ecclesiæ Plebem, n. 6. Tom. ix. p. 622.

Contra Litteras Petiliani, lib. ii. n. 126.

'What can be more mad,' he asks elsewhere, 'than to communicate in the sacraments of the Lord, and not to communicate in the words of the Lord?'

There are certain religionists who profess union with Christ, although they deny the necessity of baptism and of any sacrament. The answer given by Anglicans in such case, will apply also to their own assertion, that they hold to Christ the Head although severed from His visible representative on earth. They acknowledge a visible church, and visible sacraments; yet they deny the necessity of visible unity. They profess that Christ Himself speaks and acts through a visible and external ministry for the teaching of the faithful, and the administration of the sacraments; but they will not believe that He has constituted one visible external head, through whom He rules and governs the whole body, as the crown of the Church's hierarchy, and the centre of her unity. The Roman teaching is more consistent. It is as follows:—

See extract, above, p. 74, and Eirenicon, p. 55.

Catechism of the Council of Trent, part i. ch. x.

'Should any one object that the Church, content with one head and spouse, Jesus Christ, requires no other besides Him, the answer is at hand. For, as we have Christ the Lord not only the author of every one of the sacraments, but also their inward giver (for He it is that baptizes and that absolves, and yet He institutes men the external ministers of the sacraments); so has He placed over His Church, which He Himself rules by His indwelling Spirit, a man to be the vicar and minister of His power; for since a visible Church requires a visible head, therefore our Saviour constituted Peter head and pastor of the universal family of the faithful, when He entrusted to him

St. John xxi.

His sheep to be fed, in terms most full, so that He evidently willed that whoever should succeed him should have the same power of ruling and governing the whole Church.'

The theory is doubly fallacious.

The theory which we have been discussing asserts the possibility of unity between Christian Churches without visible intercommunion; and maintains that religious bodies may be united to the Church through Christ above, although visibly disunited from the Vicar of Christ on earth. Thus it reverses the doctrine of the great St. Thomas, who says:—

Summa 2da 2dæ Q. 39, Art. I.

'The unity of the Church consists in two things (*in duobus attenditur*), namely, in the mutual connection of the members of the Church with one another, or communication (*communicatione*): and again in the order of all the members of the Church towards one head, according to what is said, Col. ii.:—'Puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the head, from which the whole body, by joints and bands being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God.'—But this Head is Christ Himself, whose Vicar in the Church is the Supreme Pontiff. And therefore they are pronounced to be schismatics who refuse to be under (*subesse*) the Supreme Pontiff, and who will not join the communion (*communicare*) of the members of the Church who are subject to him.'

Divine Providence is wont to select the simplest means for the attainment of its ends of wisdom; 'ordering all things sweetly.' The Church is composed of human elements, though animated by a

Wisdom viii. 1.

Divine Spirit. Her members and her ministers are men, not angels; and men are liable to differences and divisions.

Christ willed His Church's unity to be abiding; and He did not neglect to make provision for that end. He selected for her the organization best calculated to preserve her unity, and, with the help of divine grace, to ensure its unceasing maintenance. There can, ordinarily, be no lasting union amongst men without a supreme authority; and there is no reason why the Church should form an exception to this rule. The Church requires an interpreter, as Holy Scripture does; and Christ has not neglected to provide her with an ever-present final tribunal, whose judgment is decisive and infallible on all things which concern man's salvation. It is true she has her general councils. But who is to interpret their meaning on any disputed question respecting it, if there is no abiding supreme authority? Nay, who is to declare with certainty of any one particular council that it is ecumenical and duly represents the universal Church? To refer the solution of such points to another future council, is simply to postpone the difficulty. Who, in turn, is to interpret that future council's decisions? Who is to assure men that it is ecumenical? Take the instance of the addition of the words *filioque* to the Creed, and the question as to whether that addition was in opposition to the decrees of early councils. The Council of Florence defined that it was not so; and

the Popes had previously permitted it. Catholics regard this decision as the teaching of God; for the Pope confirmed the council. But those who reject the Pope's authority, reject the council also; and what can remain for them but private judgment and its natural consequences? If men refuse obedience to a sovereign authority, they must accept the alternative of perpetual division and never-ending discord. Therefore, as St. Jerome says, although the Church is founded and solidly established on the Apostles collectively, who all received the keys, 'yet one amongst the twelve is chosen, that a head being constituted, occasion of schism may be removed.' *Tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio.* Adv. Jovin. i. 26.

III.

Hæc est Ecclesia Romana, cui qui non communicat, hæreticus est. Illius interest consulere omnibus, judicare de omnibus, omnibus providere, ad quam in Petro vox ista dirigitur: Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

S. Aëlredi Serm. 23 *in Isaiam.*

Historical instances.

The dissensions which at various times have arisen between different portions of the Catholic Church, are appealed to by Anglicans as precedents for the existing divisions of Christendom; and as instances of the acknowledged subsistence of real though invisible unity, in the case of outwardly separated communions.

Dr. Pusey observes:—

Eiren. p. 59.

'No one, in the face of Church-history, can or does maintain that all interruptions of intercommunion destroy unity. For Church-history records too many such interruptions, which (although never probably without fault, on the one side or on both) yet did not exclude either side from the body of Christ. Unlove began its work even in Apostles' times. At Corinth, already our Lord's words, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another," were in a degree eclipsed. Divisions began within the single Church. In the next century was that first wider rent in the Christian body, when the Bishop of Rome, against the remonstrance of many Bishops, renounced the communion of the Asiatic Churches, because they followed, as to the keeping of Easter, a tradition different from that of Rome and of the other Churches. "The East," says St. Epiphanius, "differing from the West, they received not from each other tokens of peace." The strife ceased not until the Council of Nice.'

Adv. Hær. Lib. III. T. I. ix.

The instances are not analogous.

Undoubtedly there are various steps and degrees of dissension which fall short of an absolute breach of unity. But the existing rents of Christendom are far more serious in their nature, and amount to nothing less than absolute and consummated schism. It will be found on investigation, that the instances which are produced from history, do not afford authority for that systematic and persevering repudiation of the divinely constituted authority of the Roman See, which characterises the 'Church of England;' nor for her formal and lasting breach of communion with that universal body of the faithful which 'acknowledges the Holy, Catholic,

See the Profession of Faith, p. 161.

Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches;' and renders 'true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.'

Dissensions at Corinth.

The local dissensions at Corinth involved no breach of communion with the universal Church. They continued, however, or were renewed after St. Paul had received his crown; and it was to Rome that Corinth turned for succour. We learn this from the words of the reply of Pope St. Clement I., written in the name of the Roman Church; where he explains the causes of delay in giving attention to 'those matters respecting which,' he says, 'they enquired, and to the abominable and unholy discord' which caused 'their honoured and well-known name to be greatly evil spoken of.' This is that celebrated epistle which of ancient practice used to be read in the church at Corinth; and of which St. Irenæus tells us, that 'the Church which is in Rome wrote under Clement to the Corinthians most powerful letters, reconciling them in peace amongst themselves, renewing their faith, and announcing to them the tradition which she had recently received from the Apostles.'

Ep. Div. Clementis ad Corinthios i. 1.

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iv. 23.

Cont. Hæres. III. 3.

The great Apostle and Evangelist St. John, survived St. Clement. Why did the Church of Corinth pass him by, and appeal to Rome? He was the disciple 'whom Jesus loved;' who leaned upon His bosom, and learnt from His sacred heart that lesson

of love, which, even till he joined his Lord in glory, he never ceased repeating,—'Little children, love one another.' Who more fit than he to teach that lesson to the divided church at Corinth? He was, moreover, the last of the long line of God's inspired prophets, the eagle-sighted Seer to whom was revealed the great vision of the Apocalypse. He was the last remaining of the blessed twelve, the one sole Apostle left on earth. Yet it was not to him that Corinth turned in her distress; it was to Rome; to that church which Tertullian hailed as pre-eminently 'happy, on which the Apostles have poured forth all their doctrine with their blood' (*ista quam felix Ecclesia! cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt*); and with which St. Irenæus declared it to be 'necessary for the whole Church to agree, on account of its more excellent pre-eminence.' *Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.*

De Præscript. Heret. xxxvi.

Cont. Hær. III. 2.

St. Victor and the Asiatic Churches.

The degree to which the difference extended between St. Victor and the Churches of Asia Minor, is a well-known matter of discussion amongst ecclesiastical historians. Dr. Pusey appears to have overrated it, and to have fallen into some inaccuracy. It is by no means certain that the Asiatic churches were even momentarily cut off by St. Victor from ecclesiastical communion; but the whole case affords remarkable and important testimony to the manifest

exercise, and the unquestioning acknowledgment of the power and authority of the Roman See, even at that early period (A.D. 198).

The grounds of the difference.

The Churches of Asia Minor retained down to that time, a peculiar custom—which had originated, perhaps, in tender consideration for the converts from Judaism—of celebrating the Pasch at the period of the Jewish Passover, being the 14th of the month Nisan, on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall; and they terminated their fasts on the same day, whether it was a Sunday or otherwise. When St. Polycarp visited Rome, this point was discussed between himself and Pope St. Anicetus, but without any definite conclusion; and that holy Pope is said to have tolerated the difference in discipline so far, as even to have permitted the Asiatics then resident in Rome to follow their own usage. This may have been through respect for the aged and great St. Polycarp, since the conversions from Judaism, at that period, were no longer so numerous as formerly amongst the additions to the Church.

Goschler, Dict. Theol. Cathol. Art. Pâques.

But not many years afterwards there arose a manifest danger of the practice becoming confounded with the tenets of a party which had sprung up amongst the Ebionite heretics, and which maintained that it was incumbent upon Christians not only to keep their Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover, but also to continue the legal observance of the Passover itself; asserting, in opposition to the orthodox, that Christ had done so in person before He suffered. This

evidently went beyond a mere difference in discipline; and, though it does not appear that the Asia Minor Churches can be accused of these Judaizing notions, yet it seems not improbable that an attempt was made to introduce them into Rome itself by one Blastus; a priest who had been educated in Asia. This Blastus was degraded from the sacerdotal functions by Pope St. Eleutherius, the immediate predecessor of St. Victor, for causing a schism in that city and attempting to Judaize (A.D. 180).

The conduct of St. Victor.

The early heresies were commonly connected with Judaism; and the Pope was probably apprehensive lest further toleration of the practice peculiar to Asia Minor might be productive of danger to the faith.

Ecclesiast. Histor. lib. v. cap. 23.

Eusebius states that synods and assemblies of Bishops were held upon the subject, both in the East and in the West, and that (with the exception of Asia Minor) they were unanimous in their doctrine 'that the mystery of Our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's Day; and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the Paschal fasts.'

Eccl. Hist. v. 25.

Amongst the synodical Epistles to this effect still extant at his own time, Eusebius makes particular mention of one from the Bishops of Palestine, Theophilus of Cæsarea, Narcissus of Jerusalem, Cassius of Tyre, Clarus of Ptolemais, and others. He says that, after treating at length of the tradition concerning the Pasch, which had come down to them by

continuous succession from the Apostles, at the close of the Epistle, they added these words :—'Endeavour that copies of our epistle may be sent throughout the whole Church, that we may not have to answer for those who easily mislead their own souls. And we inform you that in Alexandria also, they observe the same day as we do; for letters are conveyed from us to them and from them to us, so that we celebrate the holy day with one mind and at one time.'

The immediate vicinity of these Bishops to Asia Minor gave them full opportunity for information, and it would appear from their language that they regarded the matter as of more serious import than an ordinary divergence in discipline.

Recognition of a central authority.

It is also to be remarked that, although the same Bishops were desirous that copies of their Epistle should be sent 'throughout the whole Church,' they did not address it to the faithful in general; but to one particular Church, or person, to whose central authority and jurisdiction they appealed to publish it universally. This can have been none other than the Church of Rome, presided over by St. Victor.

De Paschæ celebratione liber, sive de æquinoctio vernali.

If the short account of this synod, appended to a treatise by St. Bede, is authentic, St. Victor sent authority (*direxit auctoritatem*) to Theophilus, by virtue of which he convoked the Bishops of his own and other provinces, and when all were assembled, he 'produced the authority of Pope Victor which had been sent to him, and explained the business which had been enjoined upon him: *protulit*

auctoritatem ad se missam Victoris papæ, et quid sibi operis fuisset injunctum ostendit.'

The Synod of the Bishops in Asia Minor.

As regards Asia Minor, there can be no question according to Eusebius, that the Synod held there under Polycrates was convoked in response to a communication from St. Victor. It is expressly declared in the synodical letter, which he records as addressed by Polycrates, in his own name and that of the other Bishops, 'to St. Victor and the Church of the city of Rome.' Polycrates says, towards its conclusion:—'I could mention also the names of the Bishops assembled, *whom you desired to be called together under me*, and whom I called'—οὓς ὑμεῖς ἠξιώσατε[1] μετακληθῆναι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ μετεκαλεσάμην.

Eccl. Hist. v. 24.

The letter of Polycrates.

This Epistle was not calculated to allay the apprehensions of the Pope. It alone, amongst the many synodical letters on the subject, maintained not only the correctness but the duty of keeping Easter according to the day of the Jewish Passover, regardless of the Sunday. 'Not thoughtlessly, at all events,' wrote Polycrates, 'do we observe the day, neither adding nor taking away.' He appealed to those great lights who had gone before him, and affirmed that they 'all observed the Pasch on the fourteenth day, *according to the Gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith.*' He referred to seven of his relatives, who had been Bishops as well as himself, and who

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. v. 24.

[1] Valesius translates this word by '*petiistis*,' which does not give its full force. According to Liddell and Scott, its Latin equivalent would be *postulâstis*.

always, he said, 'observed the day, at the time when the people' (i.e. the Jews) 'put aside the leaven.' 'I therefore, brethren,' he proceeds, 'being sixty-five years in the Lord, and having conversed with the brethren from the whole world, and having gone through the whole of the Sacred Scriptures, am not alarmed at the things which are threatened; for greater than I have said, "We ought to obey God rather than man."'—From such expressions it might naturally be inferred that these Asian Bishops looked upon the observance of their own custom as a matter of divine obligation. St. Victor appears to have regarded their letter in this light, for, according to Eusebius, he forthwith attempted (πειρᾶται) to cut off these Churches, as heterodox, from the common unity, and proclaimed by letters that they were excommunicated. But the same writer adds, that this was not pleasing to all the Bishops; and in particular he mentions St. Irenæus, who, writing in the name of those over whom he presided in Gaul, maintained that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord ought to be kept only on the day of the Lord; but, at the same time, 'becomingly (προσηκόντως) recommended to Victor not to cut off (ὡς μὴ ἀποκόπτοι) whole churches of God, who observed the tradition of an ancient custom.' Ecclesiastical historians are divided on the question as to whether St. Victor actually pronounced the excommunication; or whether he only threatened it; or whether he thought it sufficient to suspend, as St. Epiphanius says, the

Ubi supra.

εἰρηνικὰ or letters of peace between himself and the Asiatics, without fully excommunicating them.[1]

Whatever may have been the nature and extent of the measures he adopted, we have here the recorded fact of a Roman Pontiff of the second century sending out letters to Asia Minor, and, as it would appear, to other Churches also, to convoke provincial councils on the question of the time of Easter; which councils were accordingly assembled, even amongst those who varied from the Roman practice on the point to be debated; and the reply of the same dissentient Bishops was duly returned to the Roman See. Nor does their reply afford the slightest symptom that they considered Rome to have assumed any undue pre-eminence, although it speaks of threats having been used towards them. It defends the disregard of those threats, not by calling in question the authority of the Roman See, but by appealing directly to the authority of God. The appeal was unjustifiable, and betrayed the obstinacy of the Asiatics in their adherence to private opinion; but it would have had no meaning unless addressed to a superior.

Neither do the Bishops who agreed with St. Victor, but deprecated extreme measures, seem to have expressed any doubt of the legitimate power of the Pope to excommunicate the Asiatic churches. Speaking in the name of himself and the Bishops of Gaul,

[1] There were degrees of excommunication which did not entail separation from the Church. See below, p. 311.

the great St. Irenæus tacitly acknowledges this power and authority as belonging to the See of Rome, by the very fact of his urging St. Victor to abstain from the exercise of it on this occasion.

The language of Eusebius in like manner indicates the exercise of supreme authority on the part of St. Victor, and does not in any way question the legitimacy of his conduct. That ancient historian appears to say, that St. Victor actually pronounced excommunication against the Asiatic churches, but was persuaded not to enforce it by the representations of St. Irenæus and others. He states that 'he tried *to cut them off, as heterodox, from the common unity*' (ἀποτέμνειν ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας τῆς κοινῆς ἑνώσεως πειρᾶται), and that he published letters 'proclaiming them wholly excommunicated' (ἀκοινωνήτους ἅρδην πάντας τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ἀνακηρύσσων ἀδελφούς). Such a proceeding implied the consciousness of universal jurisdiction.

The language of Eusebius. Eccl. Hist. v. 24.

St. Jerome speaks of the same Pope as '*ruling the Church*,' in the following passage:—'Victor the Thirteenth' (more usually counted as Fifteenth), 'Bishop of the Roman city, who wrote on the question of Easter, and some other small works, ruled the Church (*rexit Ecclesiam*), under the Prince Severus, for ten years.'

De viris illustribus, cap. xxxiv.

Cardinal Orsi says it is commonly believed that, mainly through the efforts of St. Irenæus, peace was speedily re-established between St. Victor and the Asian Bishops; the Asiatics renouncing the error of

Result of the controversy. Orsi, Istoria Ecclesiast. lib. v. 12.

regarding their custom as divinely instituted, and as prescribed by Christ in the Gospel; and St. Victor consenting to tolerate the different usage, as a matter of mere external discipline. He states that St. Anatolius, who flourished during the latter half of the succeeding (third) century, clearly ascribed to St. Irenæus the glory of having brought about this reconciliation. St. Anatolius says, further, that, up to his time, the Asians continued to observe Easter on the fourteenth moon after the vernal equinox.

He refers to Bucher. de doctr. temp.

About fifty years after St. Anatolius, it was stated in the Epistle of the Emperor Constantine respecting the Nicene Synod, that the observance of Easter was, at that time, the same in the Asian diocese as in Rome, Italy, Britain, &c., and Cilicia. On the other hand St. Athanasius in two of his writings speaks of the Cilicians as following the Jewish custom at the period of the Council, as well as the Syrians and people of Mesopotamia; and he says that the settlement of this question was one of the objects for which the Council of Nice was convoked.

Eusebius de Vita Constantini, lib. iii. cap. 19, et Theodoreti Hist. Eccl. I. 10.

Ep. de Synodis, n. 5, Ad Afros Episc. n. 2.

But although the difference of custom continued down to that period, yet it did not then involve any interruption of communion, if such indeed was at any time the case. In addition to the abovementioned St. Anatolius (who wrote about the year 276), we have earlier testimony as to what passed, in the well-known Epistle ascribed to Firmilian, so far as it may be relied upon. Those who appeal to that Epistle as an authority in the matter of St. Cyprian,

cannot consistently reject it in the present instance. It purports to have been written about the year 255, being fifty-seven years after the affair of St. Victor and the churches of Asia Minor, and seventy years previous to the Council of Nice which was celebrated A.D. 325. As an argument against the conduct of St. Stephen it asserts that, although there was a diversity between the practice of Rome and that of other places, 'concerning the days of Pasch to be celebrated (*circa celebrandos dies Paschæ*) and many other things;' 'yet there was never, on that account, any departure from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church (*nec tamen propter hoc ab ecclesiæ catholicæ pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est*).' It is true that the exaggerated and inaccurate language of the said Epistle, in general, renders its evidence very doubtful as regards historical facts; but it can hardly be maintained that Firmilian would have written thus, if any breach of unity had existed on the subject at the period when he wrote, which was nearer to the past times of St. Victor than to the then future Council of Nice.

Op. D. Cypriani. Ep. lxxxv. Ed. Baluz. p. 144.

The Council of Nice decided that Easter should always and everywhere be kept at the time then generally observed; that is to say, on the Sunday after the 14th day of the moon first following the vernal equinox, and not on the 14th day itself which was that of the Jewish Passover; so that, when the 14th fell upon a Sunday, the Christian Easter should be kept on the Sunday following. The point at issue

See Goschler, Dict. Theol. Cathol. Art. Pâques, and Dict. des Conciles, Migne; and particularly Card. Pitra, Appendix in Tom. IV. Spicilegii Solesmensis.

had then become more complicated, through a difference in the mode of calculating the return of the proper period, and, according to St. Cyril of Alexandria, the Council decreed that the Church of Alexandria 'which excelled in astronomical science, should make known every year by letters to the Roman Church, the days of the calends or ides, according to which Easter should be celebrated; so that the Universal Church throughout the world might learn from Apostolic authority, without any disputing, the day that was fixed for the celebration of Easter.'—Here, again, we find a recognition of the Primacy of the Roman Church, and the title of Apostolic peculiarly applied to her.

Prolog. Paschal. Vide Petavii op. de Doct. Temp. Append. T. ii. p. 502.

But notwithstanding the authority of St. Cyril, it is very doubtful whether such a decree was ever made. For a long time after the Nicene Council, Rome and Alexandria differed in their astronomical calculation of the Paschal season, though perfectly agreed that Easter should be kept only on the Sunday following the 14th moon of the vernal equinox.

Such are the facts of the case of St. Victor and the Asiatics, which is appealed to in support of the theory of invisible unity.

St. Stephen, and St. Cyprian and Firmilian, Eiren. p. 59.

Dr. Pusey refers also to the discussions respecting the validity of Baptism when administered by heretics, with proper form and matter, which agitated the Church, and gave rise to serious though passing dissensions, in the third century.

There is more analogy between a thunderstorm which roars amongst the mountains, and an earthquake which severs continents; than there is between the few short years of the Cyprianic contest on a single undecided question, and the more than three centuries' fundamental rent which separates England from the Universal Church. It is most probable that St. Stephen never actually excommunicated the dissentients, though he seems to have threatened it. The letter ascribed to Firmilian appears to assert that he did so, but the inaccuracies of that document on other points, as well as its excited tone of language and its questionable authenticity, greatly diminish the value of its testimony.

St. Dionysius of Alexandria, writing to St. Sixtus II. (the immediate successor of St. Stephen), says that St. Stephen wrote 'concerning Helenus and Firmilian, and all those from Cilicia and Cappadocia, and Galatia, and all the adjoining nations, as *about to* refuse to communicate with them (*ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων*),' because they rebaptized heretics. This epistle has been only partially reproduced by Eusebius, but, so far as he has cited it in his history, it does not say whether St. Stephen afterwards actually pronounced the excommunication which it so distinctly states that he threatened against the innovators. It may, however, be inferred that the historian was not aware of his having done so, since he does not mention it when describing St. Stephen's sentiments. In a previous chapter respecting St.

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 5.

Ibid. cap. 3.

Cyprian and the Bishops with him, who considered that converts from heresy ought not on any condition to be admitted before they were rebaptized, Eusebius mentions only that 'Stephen, thinking that no innovation ought to be made contrary to the tradition which prevailed from ancient times, was *full of indignation* at this (ἐπὶ τούτῳ διηγανάκτει).' He does not even hint at any interruption of outward communion.

This view agrees with the language of St. Augustine in reference to St. Stephen and St. Cyprian. He says that 'Stephen thought that those were even to be excommunicated, who were endeavouring to overthrow the ancient custom concerning heretics who were to be received; but he (Cyprian), being moved by the difficulty of the question itself, and most largely endowed with the holy bowels of charity, thought that unity was to be preserved with those who were of a different opinion. So that, although angrily, but at the same time fraternally indignant, still the peace of Christ conquered in their hearts, that in such a dispute no evil of schism might arise between them.' *Ita quamvis commotius sed tamen fraternè indignaretur, vicit tamen pax Christi in cordibus eorum, ut in tali disceptatione nullum inter eos malum schismatis oriretur.* Elsewhere he observes that, though it is not found on record that St. Cyprian corrected his opinion, yet it may not unsuitably be believed of such a man that he did correct it, and that perhaps the fact was suppressed by those persons who were too ready to take pleasure in his error, and

De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. v. cap. 25, n. 36.

Epist. xciii. ad Vincentium Rogatistam, nn. 38, 40.

who were unwilling to lose the patronage of one who was so great. There were not wanting those, he says, who maintained that St. Cyprian never held these opinions, but that the letters on the subject were forged and put forth as his, just as many things were forged in the names of the Apostles; and he adds that, in any case, either 'his opinion was other than has been said; or else he afterwards corrected it by the rule of truth; or else he entirely covered over this spot (so to speak) in his most pure breast, with the bosom of charity, whilst he most abundantly defended the unity of the Church which was increasing in all the world, and most perseveringly maintained the bond of peace. For it is written, *Charity covereth a multitude of sins.* There is to be added also, that as a most fruitful branch, if there was anything in him to be corrected, the Father purged him with the sickle of His passion. *For every branch*, saith the Lord, *that beareth fruit in Me, that one will my Father purge, that it may bring forth more fruit.* Whence, but that keeping fixed in the expansion of the vine, he deserted not the root of unity? For, though he should deliver his body to be burned, and not have charity, it would profit him nothing.'

1 St. Peter iv. 8.

St. John xv. 2.

1 Cor. xiii. 3.

St. Jerome says that 'those selfsame Bishops, who had decided with St. Cyprian that heretics were to be rebaptized, having returned to the ancient custom, sent forth a new decree.'

Dial. adv. Lucif. n. 23.

Our own Venerable Bede, though he does not give

Quæstionum Liber n. 5.

his authority, states it as a fact that, through the abundance of his good works, St. Cyprian 'merited to be speedily corrected, and to be brought back to the universal law of Holy Church, by the instruction of spiritual men.'

Ep. lxxxii. Ed. Baluz. Paris, 1726.

It is evident from one of the Epistles of St. Cyprian, that he had communication through messengers with Rome, at the time of the persecution under Valerian, which commenced in the year 257 and in which the Pope, St. Stephen, as well as his successor, St. Sixtus II., suffered martyrdom.

A reference to dates will show that, if there was any suspension of communion at all between the Roman See and St. Cyprian, it can have been only of momentary duration. St. Stephen was elected Pope A.D. 253. St. Cyprian's friendly letter, urging him to depose Marcion of Arles, is placed by Tillemont A.D. 254. The quarrel does not appear to have then commenced. It is thought that St. Stephen gained his heavenly crown in the year 257, having been beheaded in his pontifical chair whilst celebrating the holy mysteries. St. Cyprian followed him A.D. 258, and, as Tillemont remarks, 'the Roman Church has always shown such great veneration for St. Cyprian, that there can be no doubt that he died in unity with her; not only through the disposition of his heart, but also through external communion.'

Hist. Ecclesiast. tom. iv. p. 161.

He was martyred on the 14th of September, six years to a day after the Roman Pontiff, St. Cornelius.

The Roman Church delights to link St. Cyprian with St. Cornelius. Her martyrology names them together on their birthday to eternal life, and describes St. Cyprian as 'most illustrious for learning and sanctity.' The same pages again unite their names on the 16th of September, when the Church honours both in one festival, one mass, one office, and one collect. Side by side, too, have they been depicted by ancient piety in their sacerdotal vestments, and indicated by name in the Roman catacomb of St. Calixtus; and, in the most solemn canon of her mass, amongst the few illustrious Saints whose intercession before God is expressly invoked therein, daily does the Roman Church commemorate St. Cornelius and St. Cyprian.

De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea Christiana, tom. i. (tav. vi.). Roma, 1864.

The 'Eirenicon' speaks of the dissension as having arisen 'through the Bishop of Rome, of whom one, now counted a saint, said,—"While thinking that all may be excommunicated by him, he excommunicated himself alone from all."' Did the learned author of that work forget that the Bishop of Rome, to whom he thus alludes, is himself enrolled amongst the saints?—that the Universal Church conformed to his judgment on the question?—and that his conduct affords one of the most striking amongst the numerous examples of the vigilance and the authority of the Roman See, from which even the great and holy St. Cyprian could not be exempted?

The letter of Firmilian.

The letter from which Dr. Pusey extracts this sentence has been alluded to already. It is ascribed to

Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and it forms Epistle No. 75 in the works of St. Cyprian, by whom it is said to have been translated from the original Greek. Firmilian, its reputed author, was one of the most eminent men of his age. His memory is honoured in the Greek Menology, though his name has not been placed amongst the saints of the Roman Calendar. The Epistle in question is so utterly unworthy of his high reputation that it seems quite incredible he should have written it, or that the great St. Cyprian should have translated it. It appears, however, to be accepted as genuine by the majority of the learned; though others have maintained it to be a forgery of some Donatist, subsequent to the time of St. Augustine but in the same century. That great doctor never speaks of it, and it is argued that if it had then been extant, the Donatists could hardly have failed to have used it against him, as they used the Epistles on the same subject which are attributed to St. Cyprian. Nor is the letter mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria, though he speaks of Firmilian—nor by Eusebius—nor by St. Cyprian himself; and the Greek version, from which it is said to have been translated, has never been discovered. But, whoever compounded it, it is inaccurate as to facts, passionate as to temper, and, in language, exaggerated beyond bounds. Still, with all this, it bears testimony to the then existing claims of the Roman See. 'I am justly indignant,' says the writer, 'at this so open and manifest folly of Stephen—that he who so glories in the place of his Episcopate, and contends

Ed. Baluz. Paris, 1726.

P. 148 ed. citat.

that he holds the succession of Peter upon whom the foundations of the Church have been laid, should bring in many other rocks, and should set up the new edifices of many churches, inasmuch as he maintains by his authority that baptism exists in them.'

The excited and unworthy tone of the letter may be perceived from the following passage, the concluding sentence of which has been deemed worthy of a place in the 'Eirenicon.' The words are addressed to the Roman Pontiff, St. Stephen:—'Thou fearest not,' so it runs, 'the judgment of God, giving testimony to heretics against the Church, though it is written: *A false witness shall not be unpunished.* Nay, thou art worse than all heretics. *Quin immo tu hæreticis omnibus pejor es.* For when many, having perceived their error, come from thence to thee, that they may accept the true light of the Church, thou helpest on the errors of those who come; and, having obscured the light of the Church's truth, thou addest to the darkness of heretical night. And when they confess themselves to be in sin and that they have no portion of grace, and that on this account they come to the Church, thou withdrawest from them the remission of sins which is given in baptism, whilst thou sayest that they are already baptized and that they have obtained the grace of the Church outside the Church. Nor dost thou understand that, when the day of judgment shall come, their souls are to be required at thy hand, who hast denied the drink of the Church to the thirsty, and hast been cause of death to those

Ibid. p. 150.

Prov. xix. 9.

who wished to live. And moreover thou art indignant. Behold with what ignorance (*imperitia*) thou darest to censure those who are striving for the truth against falsehood. For who ought with the more justice to be indignant against the other? Whether, indeed, he who joins with the enemies of God, or he who combines for the truth of the Church against him who joins the enemies of God? Unless it be manifest that the ignorant (*imperitos*) are also angry and passionate, whilst through want of prudence and of speech (*consilii et sermonis*) they are easily moved to anger, so that of none other more than of thee doth the divine scripture say: *A passionate man prepareth strifes, and an angry man heapeth up sins.* For how many strifes and dissensions hast thou prepared for the churches of the whole world? How great sin hast thou heaped up for thyself when thou hast separated thyself from so many flocks? For thou hast cut off thyself. Do not deceive thyself. If, indeed, he is truly schismatic who shall make himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For whilst thou thinkest that all can be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all.'

Prov. xxix. 22.

The letter contains other passages of like character, and it is from such unseemly railing against God's truth and its holy defender, that it has been sought to wrest a weapon against the authority of the Roman See; whereas the quotation in question, when taken with its context, bears witness to the existence of

that authority, at the period when it was written. The words would lose their force unless applied to a superior. It would be a meaningless truism to tell an ordinary bishop that he would cut himself alone off from unity if he excommunicated all others. Nor can it be supposed that St. Stephen would have threatened the excommunication of distant churches without a consciousness and certainty of unquestioned universal jurisdiction. It is to be remarked that the letter distinctly states that St. Stephen 'thought he could excommunicate all.' A few lines subsequently, it openly acknowledges his primacy; observing ironically, 'how diligently Stephen has fulfilled the commands and wholesome admonitions of the Apostle, practising *in the first place* "humility and mildness" (*humilitatem sensus et lenitatem primo in loco servans*).' Ephes. iv. 2.

Besides all this, looking merely to the historical fact of the respective numbers, the assertion was flagrantly false. It is notorious not only that St. Stephen did not stand alone, but that his doctrine was that of the vast majority of bishops.

Thus, St. Augustine speaks of the party of St. Cyprian, as some 'fifty orientals, and seventy or a few more Africans, against many thousands of bishops, to whom this error was displeasing throughout the whole world.' It is only the blindness of passion or the over-zeal of a forgerer, which can account for the hyperbolical assertion ascribed to Firmilian, that St. Stephen had cut himself off from all.

If all this be taken into account, and if it is remembered, further, that the doctrine of the Pope thus scandalously denounced as heretical, has been subsequently acknowledged by the Universal Church as an article of the faith; and that, on the other hand, the opinion defended by the writer of the letter ascribed to Firmilian has been rejected as heresy; it will not be difficult to estimate the actual value of that writer's angry exclamation against Pope St. Stephen, which has been brought forward as the saying of 'one now counted a Saint.'

The respect due to Firmilian.

The letter in question is not a saintly one, whoever may have been its author. Even saints whilst in this mortal life are liable to human weakness. The epistle stands self-condemned; but far be it from me to speak disparagingly of a Bishop whose name holds so high a place in the Church's annals, as that of the great Firmilian of Cappadocia. He is mentioned by St. Gregory of Nyssa as the early friend of St. Gregory the Wonder-worker, and as his companion in relinquishing the vain philosophy of the world for the true philosophy of the Cross. He says that Firmilian resembled him in disposition, 'as he showed by his after life when he was the ornament of the Church of the Cæsareans.' Eusebius mentions him first amongst the most eminent Eastern Bishops who were assembling at Antioch against the heresy of Paul of Samosata, when he fell sick upon the way and died at Tarsus about the year 269. The synodical letter of the same council, which is

De vita S. Greg. Thaumaturgi.

Hist. Eccles. vii. 28.

Ibid. cap. 30.

addressed to Dionysius Bishop of the Roman city, to Maximus of Alexandria, and to the Universal Catholic Church, makes especial mention of Firmilian, as one of those whose presence had been solicited by letters. It says that he had twice before come to Antioch and condemned the novelty. It names him in company with St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and styles them together, 'men of blessed memory.' It is not probable that one thus spoken of in an epistle of such a nature, formally addressed to the Roman Pontiff and the whole Church, can have died out of visible communion with Rome.

Evidence of the office of the Roman See.

As in the case of St. Victor and the Asiatics, the points on which the Cyprianic contest is appealed to by Dr. Pusey are involved in great obscurity, whilst the office which the providence of God has entrusted to the Roman See, is clearly illustrated thereby. Apart from that office, what was there in this matter to induce Rome to raise a voice of authority throughout Africa and the East? On what other ground were Africa and the East so disturbed by Rome's denunciation of their novelties? As regards his personal influence, who will compare St. Stephen to the great and the eloquent St. Cyprian? The error moreover was supported by Synods, and by Bishops illustrious for virtue, many of whom as well as St. Cyprian were afterwards found worthy of the martyr's crown; it rested on plausible arguments, and apparently just interpretations of Holy Scripture.

To human eyes it might seem, on the other hand,

that the cause of truth was inadequately represented by the simple declaration of St. Stephen, in few but decided words condemning novelty, maintaining tradition, setting aside the opinion of St. Cyprian and of all the Bishops of his party throughout Africa, Asia, and the whole world, wherever they might profess it. But this simple declaration was the voice of Christ in His Vicar. In opposition to it, all the Synods, all the learning, all the eminence, all the holiness, all the plausible appeals to Scripture, even of Bishops like Cyprian, prove as nothing; they become as dreams; they add but another page to the history of human weakness, human error, and human impotence apart from God.

Rome instructs the nations. At times her word of truth may seem to lie dormant in men's hearts; but, like all that is divine, if its work is silent it is strong. As in the case before us, it is often found that those who at first oppose it, after a few brief years have passed, are brought to confess its power, and to proclaim that Rome's teaching is the word of the living God. Why does Rome prove always right, and Asia, Africa, Cyprian, Firmilian, and others who oppose her always wrong? It is not from any human super-excellence; not from any superior human talents; not from any greater human power. It is, because to Peter, and through him to Rome, and not to Carthage or to Asia, or elsewhere throughout the globe, was the command of Christ addressed:—'Feed my lambs, Feed my sheep;'—

'Strengthen and confirm thy brethren.' It is because to Peter, and to none other, was it said:—*Ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam.* St. Matt. xvi. 18.

The universe has to learn its faith from Rome, because to Rome has its guardianship been entrusted by a power which is divine. Rome holds it not for herself alone, but for the good of the human race; therefore that divine power unceasingly assists her, and preserves her from unfaithfulness to the light and grace, which are superabundantly bestowed upon her for the fulfilment of her high commission.

St. Vincent of Lerins points to the conduct of St. Stephen in this matter, as one out of many examples afforded by those blessed ones who 'shine, like the seven-branched candlestick with the sevenfold light of the Holy Spirit;' examples which most plainly show to posterity how, in spite of vain words, the audacity of profane novelty may be trampled under foot by the authority of hallowed antiquity.—'Such examples,' he says, 'abound; but, not to be tedious, let us fix on one, and that the rather from the Apostolic See, that all may perceive more clearly than the light, with how great strength, with how great zeal, with what earnest striving, the blessed succession of the blessed Apostles will always defend the integrity of the religion once received.' Commonitorium. A.D. 434.

'At one time, then, Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, of venerable memory' (a predecessor of St. Circa A.D. 217.

Cyprian, in that See), 'the first of all mortals, in contradiction to the divine canon, in contradiction to the rule of the Universal Church, in contradiction to the sentiments of all his fellow-priests, in contradiction to the custom and the institutions of ancestors, judged that baptism was to be repeated. Which presumption brought in so much evil as to have afforded, not only an example of sacrilege to all heretics, but also an occasion of error even to certain Catholics. When therefore, on all sides, every one was exclaiming against the novelty of the thing, and all Priests in all directions were resisting it, each one according to the measure of his zeal; then Pope Stephen, of blessed memory, who presided over the Apostolic See, withstood it, together indeed with the rest of his colleagues, but yet before the rest; esteeming it fitting, as I imagine, if he should surpass the others as much in the devotion of his faith, as he excelled them in the authority of his position. In short, in the letter which was then sent to Africa, he decreed (*sanxit*) in these words:—Let there be no innovation on what is handed down. *Nihil novandum, nisi quod traditum est.* For the holy and prudent man understood that the rule of piety admits of nothing else, except that all things should be consigned to the children with the same fidelity with which they have been received from the fathers; and that we ought not to lead religion where we will, but rather to follow wherever it may lead us; and that it belongs to Christian modesty and gravity,

not to hand down to posterity what is from ourselves, but to preserve entire those things which have been received by us from our ancestors. What, then, was the end of the whole business? What indeed, but the usual and accustomed end? Antiquity, forsooth, is maintained; novelty is rejected.'

The rescript of St. Stephen does not appear to have been intended by him as a definition of dogma, but as a practical rule to be followed under the existing circumstances. Such is the opinion of Cardinals Orsi and Bellarmine. The latter says that St. Stephen 'did not wish to make the matter itself of faith, without a General Council: but he wished only that in the meantime the ancient custom should be observed.'

De irreform. Rom. Pont. judicio, l. iii. c. 4.

De summo Pontif. Lib. iv. cap. 7, n. 10.

The Council of Arles (A.D. 314), at which Cæcilianus of Carthage and several other African Bishops assisted, put forth a decree to the same effect as St. Stephen's rescript; viz. that converts from heresy were not to be rebaptized, but only receive imposition of hands, excepting in the case of defect in the essentials of their previous baptism. The Ecumenical Council of Nice (A.D. 325) practically confirmed this decree: for it made no allusion to baptism in its canon respecting the reception of converts from the Cathari; whereas in the case of the Paulianists (whose baptism was defective) it is enjoined, that they are by all means to be baptized when they come to the Church.

Conc. Nicen. can. 8.

Ibid. can. 19.

It would not be right to pass on without observing

that there are authors, worthy of consideration, who maintain that the letters of St. Cyprian on this subject, as well as the letter of Firmilian, were forged by ancient heretics. Their opinion is not commonly accepted, but, as may be seen above, it existed even in the time of St. Augustine, who does not absolutely reject it, but says that he himself does not deny that such were the sentiments of St. Cyprian, for two reasons: first, because the style resembles his; and, secondly, because the letters attributed to him render the argument against the Donatists the more invincible by showing, that not even the reception of converts whom he considered as unbaptized, could induce St. Cyprian to separate from the Universal Church.

Vide supra, p. 227.

Ep. xciii. ad Vincent. Rogat. n. 39.

The said epistles have been appealed to as evidence that St. Cyprian was opposed to the claims of the Roman See. But the real sentiments of a writer are to be gathered from the habitual expression of his thoughts in moments of calm, rather than from occasional passages penned at a time of trial and strong excitement. The works of St. Cyprian, and even these very letters, afford undeniable testimony to his faith in the primacy of St. Peter and of St. Peter's successors at Rome. He observes to Quintus that 'Peter whom the Lord elected first, and upon whom He built His Church (*Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam*), when Paul afterwards contended with him respecting circumcision,' did not arrogantly answer that 'he

Epist. lxxi. ed. citat.

held the primacy (*se primatum tenere*) and ought rather to be yielded to by new disciples posterior to himself.'—He writes to the Numidian Bishops:—'There is one baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one Church, founded by Christ the Lord upon Peter, for the origin and rule of unity (*una ecclesia a Christo Domino super Petrum*[1] *origine unitatis et ratione fundata*).'—To Jubaianus, after observing that 'it is manifest where and by whom remission of sins can be given,' he proceeds:—'For to Peter first upon whom He has built the Church, and whence he institutes and shows the origin of unity, the Lord gave this power that that should be loosed in heaven which he should have loosed on earth.' *Nam Petro primùm Dominus, super quem ædificavit ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit ut id solveretur in cœlis quod ille solvisset in terris.* After thus specially distinguishing St. Peter, he passes on to say that after the resurrection also the power of remitting sins was conferred on the apostles. St. Cyprian seems to delight in bringing forward this prerogative of St. Peter as an attribute of the Church, even when it seems superfluous. Thus, in his book, 'De Bono Patientiæ,' in quoting the words of the

Ep. lxx. ibid.

Ep. lxxiii. ibid.

St. John xx. 21–23.

Op. D. Cyp. p. 250, ed. citata.

[1] Baluzius concludes from ancient authorities that the correct reading is here *Petrum*, and not *petram*, as in some editions (notes to St. Cyprian, p. 497). The meaning of the sentence would not however be affected by reading *petram*, since the terms are synonymous. The other quotations in the text testify abundantly that St. Cyprian believed and taught that the Church is founded upon Peter as the rock, and as the centre of unity.

beloved disciple, he gives him the simple appellation of 'John the Apostle,' but when he quotes St. Peter in the next sentence, he describes him as 'Peter, upon whom the Church is built by the judgment of the Lord.' *Item Petrus, super quem ecclesia Domini dignatione fundata est, in epistola sua ponit et dicit, &c.*

It is evident also that St. Cyprian did not regard these prerogatives as confined to the person of St. Peter alone, but that he considered them to be inherited by his successors in the Roman See; for he expressly speaks of the Roman Pontiffs as occupying the place of Peter. He says of Pope St. Cornelius, who succeeded St. Fabian, that he was elected 'when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter and the rank of the sacerdotal chair, was vacant.' *Cùm Fabiani locus, id est, cùm locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis, vacaret.* Elsewhere he speaks of those who 'dare to sail and to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons to the chair of Peter and to the principal Church, from whence the sacerdotal unity hath arisen, nor consider that they are Romans whose faith has been praised in the Apostle's preaching, to whom faithlessness cannot have access.' *Navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et prophanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides apostolo prædicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum.*

Ep. lii. ed. citat.

Ep. lv. ed. citat.

Other well-known passages might be added from the same holy father, and, for the simple-minded, there needs no comment on them; but such as are guided by preconceived opinions will explain away the clearest language and the most patent facts. May God preserve us from eyes that see not, ears that hear not, and hearts that will not understand His voice!

St. Meletius and the divisions in Antioch.

During the latter half of the fourth century, the Catholics of Antioch were divided into two parties respecting the rival claims of St. Meletius and Paulinus to the episcopate of that important diocese. The title of Paulinus is said to have been preferred in the West, and that of St. Meletius in the East. It is a portion of history which is imperfectly known and which particularly demands attention, since the case of St. Meletius and his party is appealed to as furnishing a precedent for the separated position of the established Church of England, and as affording an instance of outwardly divided unity.

Eiren. p. 60.

It is unreservedly affirmed in the 'Eirenicon' that, 'St. Meletius out of communion with Rome, presided (as it were, marked out by God) at the second general council;' and that, 'when departed, he was owned to be a Saint by those who, in his lifetime, owned him not as a Bishop,'—alluding to Rome and the West.

See extract, above, p. 70.

Dr. Forbes observes:—'Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity is maintained; for the blessed Meletius is a Saint.'

St. Meletius enjoyed Roman Catholic communion many years before the second general council.

The schism in question was internal, and neither side was cut off, as is the case with England, from Rome and the universal church. There is undeniable proof that before the period of the second general council, St. Meletius was in formal and acknowledged 'communion with Rome;' nor can it be assumed that he was personally out of her communion, even when she demurred respecting his claims to the Bishopric of Antioch. It is notorious that after his early errors had been redeemed by his subsequent sufferings for religion and formal profession of the Nicene faith, for a long time before the second general council, St. Meletius enjoyed, and was known at Rome to be enjoying, the constant and intimate communion of St. Basil the Great and other eminent Catholic Bishops, without any interruption of their own acknowledged episcopal communion with the Roman See. This shows that, even at that time, St. Meletius was not out of communion with Rome.

It was never denied that Meletius was a Bishop. The only question at issue was whether he or Paulinus ought to be considered the rightful Bishop of Antioch. Rome never pronounced a formal judgment on the case, and her silence implied toleration. Rome and the whole Catholic world now venerate Meletius as a Saint, though Rome and the West, perhaps influenced by the great St. Athanasius, would not prefer his claims to those of Paulinus in respect to the See of Antioch. There is no evidence however that Meletius was ever condemned by Rome, or cut off by her

from ecclesiastical communion, or placed under any censure. It is not recorded that Rome remonstrated with any of the Eastern Catholic Bishops in consequence of their open espousal of his communion and advocacy of his claims. Rome received communications expressly from Meletius and other Bishops of his party, on the affairs of the East in general; nor did the Pope even reject the deacon of Meletius himself, who was sent to him upon that errand.

This miserable schism respecting the Bishopric of Antioch formed an exceptional case in an exceptional period. Great spiritual interests were at stake, and it was extremely difficult for those who were at a distance to obtain accurate information respecting the facts. It is not therefore surprising that the anomaly should have been tolerated for a while, and that the ecclesiastical law which forbade the co-existence of two Bishops in one diocese should have been looked upon as temporarily suspended through the necessities of the case. Such appears to have been the view which was taken. Rome ultimately assented to, and even seems to have recommended, a compromise, without any positive adjudication of the rival claims.

After explaining the commencement of the division, and briefly noticing one or two points in its after history, I shall produce incontrovertible evidence that the communion and ecclesiastical position of Meletius were distinctly recognised by Rome before the assembling of the second general council.

No argument for the existence of outwardly divided unity.

This exceptional and transitory period of the Church's history in Antioch does not afford any support to the present theory of an outwardly divided unity. It is true that the Catholics of that diocese were visibly divided within themselves, and outwardly separated into two parties. But, as has been said of St. Meletius, the members of both these parties were visibly and outwardly one with the universal church. Each of the divided Catholic parties of Antioch was in full and unquestioned outward communion with, at least, either the Eastern, or the Western, Bishops; and, though the difference of opinion may have produced, or increased, a degree of coldness between these Bishops, it did not occasion an interruption of their mutual, and visible, ecclesiastical communion. There is no reason to suppose that, after the promulgation of the indulgence accorded to the abjurors of Arianism, in the year 362, either Meletius or Paulinus, or any of their individual followers, were regarded on either side as cut off from Catholic communion, either in the West or in the East.

Vide infra, pp. 282–284.

Both parties were represented in the one universal body. St. Basil upheld the claims of Meletius. St. Athanasius and St. Epiphanius befriended Paulinus. Yet these great fathers and doctors of the Church, along with many others who respectively preferred one or other of the differing Catholic sides at Antioch, were all the time united by the ties of a saintly friendship, as well as by the bonds of communion in the Church. In short, it is notorious that all the great

champions of the faith, and all the Catholic Bishops of the world, whether they respectively favoured Meletius or upheld Paulinus, were nevertheless in outward and visible communion both with each other and with Rome. This could not have been the case if either Meletius or Paulinus, or either of their respective parties, whether inside or outside of Antioch, had been out of the communion of Rome and the Universal Church.

Contrast between Antioch and England.

The division between the Catholics of Antioch arose from local and internal differences. It was so to speak a family quarrel, deplorable in itself but separating neither side from the great paternal home. It bore no sort of resemblance to the subsequent schism of the Greeks; nor can it justly be pleaded as a precedent for the separation of the so-called Church of England from her parent stock and stem, and from the universal Christian family.

Isolation of the 'Church of England.'

England is in a position of isolation excepting from the religious bodies of her own creation. She finds neither advocate nor defender in the whole of Catholic Christendom. England makes no appeal to Rome; England claims no communion with Rome; England's communion is rejected by every individual Bishop who is in communion with Rome; and no single member of the established English Church can be lawfully communicated with in sacred things, by any single individual of the faithful in communion with Rome. How different was the position of each of the Catholic parties at Antioch!

Comparison.

In the case of Antioch, there was internal division,

but no severance from the *orbis terrarum*, and both sides looked up anxiously to Rome.

In the case of England, there is a notorious separation from the universal church, and an avowed rejection of the authority of the Roman See.

The grounds of dissension are not analogous.

Again, as regards the grounds of dissension, no analogy whatever exists between the two. In the sixteenth century, England cut herself off from Rome and the Universal Church, rejecting the authority of the Apostolic See, and adopting her own private interpretation of the Scriptures, and of the voice of primitive Christianity. This severance continues—and it *must* continue so long as England asserts the claim of an isolated independence. Such was not the case with any of the Catholics at Antioch. History does not record one single word or act by which either Meletius, or Paulinus, or any of their respective followers, ever called in question the supreme authority of Rome, or manifested any difference from her on any point of doctrine. Both these parties eagerly sought her favour; both proclaimed themselves in her communion. We are assured of the latter fact by St. Jerome, in one of his letters to Pope St. Damasus, asking for guidance under his perplexity.

Epist. xvi. ed. Vallars. Veron. 1734, &c. Vide infra, p. 326.

Nor was there any point of faith respecting which the Catholics of Antioch disagreed amongst themselves, or differed from Rome and the Universal Church. Their division was upon a question of rightful local jurisdiction, mixed up, no doubt, with

personal feeling on both sides. It was aggravated by the dispute respecting the number of the divine *Hypostases*, but in the case of the Antiochians this did not involve the faith. Meletius and his adherents employed the word to designate the divine *persons*, and consequently maintained that there were three. Paulinus and his party interpreted it of the divine *substance*, and therefore affirmed there was but one. The prevalence of the Sabellian and Arian heresies had given rise to this question respecting the most appropriate mode for the definition of one and the same truth. The two parties at Antioch differed upon that point, but, as regards actual Catholic doctrine, they were equally and alike orthodox, as is testified by Theodoret and others.

S. Athanasii Tomus ad Antiochenses. See below, pp. 288, 289.

Eccl. Hist. iii. 4.

Testimony of St. Gregory Nazianzen.

There is extant a contemporary sermon, preached by St. Gregory Nazianzen, at Constantinople, in the year 379, which bears witness to the unity of faith of the Catholics of that city, although they were divided into two parties respecting Meletius and Paulinus. It speaks also of the disposition of the heretics of the day to exaggerate the extent of the dissension. It may be presumed that, besides those of Constantinople to whom it was addressed, its remarks would apply to the Catholics of Antioch to whose pastors it refers, and whose division had been extended to Constantinople. Thus it further affords strong presumptive evidence, to say the least, in favour of the usually received opinion that a reconciliation had been effected in the same year between Meletius

and Paulinus, though the contest was unhappily renewed by the partisans of the former immediately after his decease.

This St. Gregory—styled, pre-eminently, 'The Theologian'—was an ardent lover of peace, which he described as a blessing extolled by all, but preserved by few. He eloquently bewailed its loss; more, he said, than Jacob bewailed the loss of Joseph, or David the death of his friend Jonathan, or that of Absalom his son. He greatly loved and admired Meletius, but his end and aim was peace; and when, at last, it was restored in Constantinople, he delivered the oration to be found in his works, under the title of 'The Third Peace Discourse, on the agreement which we, of the same faith, made after the conflict.' Εἰρηνικὸς γ' εἰς τὴν σύμβασιν, ἣν μετὰ τὴν σύστασιν ἐποιησάμεθα οἱ ὁμόδοξοι.

Oratio 22, i.

'We differed not,' he says therein, 'respecting the divine nature, but respecting goodly order.' . . . 'Concerning the divine nature, we no less consent and agree than does the Godhead with itself, if this be not a great thing to say.' . . . 'But there were matters upon which we differed. Nor will I deny that it was bad enough to quarrel even about them; for not any entrance or handle ought to be given to the wicked one, nor license to evil tongues; still, it was not so bad as it appears to those who traduce our conduct. For since, being men, we are liable to sin, our fault was that of loving our pastors to excess, and that we could not discover which of two good

Orat. 23, iii. iv. ed. Bened. Paris, 1778.

men was the most to be preferred, until we agreed to admire them both alike. This is the complaint against us. Let anyone who pleases censure or acquit us on these points. This is the security of the heretics — τοῦτο τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἡ ἀσφάλεια. But, however much you may desire it, besides this there is nothing. "Dead and rotten flies," saith the preacher, "make oil to stink;" and envy will try to give an ill savour to things that are good, but it will not be able. For, as appears to Esdras and to me, "the strongest of all things is truth."'

Eccles. x. 1.

The seeds of the schism between the Catholics of Antioch were sown by the impiety of the Arians.

The origin of the schism.

St. Vincent of Lerins observes that 'the profane novelty of Arianism, like some Bellona or Fury, having first taken captive the Emperor, and then subjugated all the highest posts of the palace to its new laws, from thenceforth never ceased to confound and disturb all things, private and public, sacred and profane; to show no distinction towards what was good and true, but to smite whomsoever it would, as if from a higher region.'—An exemption from this fiery trial could hardly be expected in the case of the third ecclesiastical city of Christendom, peculiarly hateful to the devil, as is observed by St. Basil, because it was the birthplace of the name of Christian.

Commonitorium, propè principium.

Epist. cclviii. Epiphanio episc.

No sooner had the Arians been condemned in the great council of Nicæa than they formed the iniquitous design of intruding the favourers of their

heresy into the sees of the Catholic bishops, wherever they could devise the means. Their first efforts were directed against St. Eustathius, who had distinguished himself as one of the earliest and most vigorous of their opponents, and who at that time occupied the aforesaid very eminent and important see of Antioch. About the year 330, Eusebius of Nicomedia, with others of that party, assembled a conciliabule at Antioch, in which they unlawfully obtained the deposition of Eustathius by means of false and shameful accusations, supported, in part, by a suborned witness, who afterwards openly confessed her guilt. They maligned him to the Emperor, and obtained his banishment into a distant country. One of their own bishops was then thrust into his place, and for a period of thirty years the great episcopal chair of Antioch continued in the undisturbed possession of a series of Arian or Eusebian prelates. Eudoxius, of unhappy memory, belonged to this line of bishops. Having left, or been expelled from, the see of Antioch, he obtained that of Constantinople, A.D. 359, or early in the year 360.

Theodoreti Eccl. Hist. lib. i. 21, ii. 31. Socratis Hist. Eccl. lib. i. 24. Sozomeni Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. 19.

Election of Meletius.

Theodoret relates that the Emperor Constantius afterwards called together the bishops, enforcing the universal rejection of both the extreme terms—*homoousion* and *heterousion* (ἀρνηθῆναι πάντας καὶ τὸ ὁμοούσιον ἀναγκάζων καὶ τὸ ἑτεροούσιον). He says, that many bishops being thus assembled from various provinces, they proposed in the first place to provide a pastor for the see of Antioch, and that, through

Theod. ii. 31. Socrat. ii. 44. Sozom. iv. 28.

the influence of the Arians, though with the concurrence of certain of the orthodox, Meletius was accordingly elected to fill the place left vacant by Eudoxius.

Meletius came originally from Melitine, in the Lesser Armenia, and it appears that he was of noble birth, and in the possession of an estate. According to the general opinion amongst writers of authority, he was first consecrated bishop to the see of Sebaste, in Armenia;[1] but being unable to endure the unruliness of the people, he had found repose in the city of Berœa in Syria, where he was residing when summoned to the ecclesiastical throne of Antioch.

There cannot be any question that, during his earlier life, Meletius was intimately connected with the Arian faction, though it is uncertain to what extent he was involved in their errors. Even his warm-spoken panegyrist, St. Gregory Nazianzen, is compelled to interrupt the strain of his praises in order to acknowledge, in a parenthesis, that 'to a slight extent he was led astray by the stranger's hand.'

Carmen de vitâ suâ, v. 1523. t. ii. p. 754, ed. Paris, 1840.

εἰ καὶ ξένῃ τι μικρὸν ἐκλάπῃ χερί.

But this remark would apply only to the earlier part of his career, and not to the period after his election to the bishopric of Antioch, during which he boldly confessed, and suffered for, the faith.

[1] Baronius (an. 360, n. 48) seems to suggest that Meletius may have been translated from Berœa to Sebaste, but there is not sufficient ground for such a supposition. See Valesius, Annot. in Socrat. lib. ii. c. 44; and Tillemont, note iii. sur S. Melèce.

Eccles. Hist. v. 1. 5. The Arian historian Philostorgius, says that Meletius at one time 'feignedly professed the *heterousion*' (τὸ ἑτερούσιον ὑπεκείνετο). According to Socrates, Meletius was present at the conciliabule of Seleucia, and signed the Arian and semi-Arian profession of faith therein put forth by the Acacians. But though the said document is recorded by St. Epiphanius, with the signatures of forty-three bishops, that of Meletius does not appear amongst them, nor is it certain whether he was at that time a bishop at all. St. Epiphanius, however, mentions him as belonging to the party of Acacius, which he numbers amongst those whose 'whole work was full of fraud.' He also states that Meletius was made bishop of Antioch by Acacius and his party, and that they considered him at the time to be of the same opinion as themselves.

Hist. Eccl. ii. 44.

Hæres. lxxiii. 25, 26.

Ibid. 27, 28.

It is certain that before his elevation to the see of Antioch, Meletius had done nothing openly in defence of the truth, even if he had taken no active part against it; and though he may never have committed himself to any overt profession of heresy, yet, if he was always a Catholic at heart, he must have been guilty in his earlier career of culpable indulgence towards error, and of unworthy dissimulation respecting his actual sentiments. This is manifest from the fact that the Arians universally accounted him as their own, until after the period of his election to the see of Antioch. According to Nicephorus Callistus, his original creation as bishop, to

Hist. Eccl. ix. 48.

the see of Sebaste, was owing to the suffrages of the Arians. This statement may have been derived from Sozomen, who, in mentioning certain appointments that were made by the extreme Arian party, called after their leader, *Eudoxians*, includes as one of them that of Meletius to the rule of the church of Sebaste. Hist. Eccl. iv. 25.

There can be no doubt that Meletius was at that time commonly reputed to be an Arian, both in doctrine and communion, and that he was elevated to the episcopal chair of Antioch through the combined influence of the different sections of Arianism. St. Epiphanius, as above mentioned, attributes his said elevation to the semi-Arian Acacius and his party. Philostorgius also recounts it as the work of Acacius, observing, in the bitterness of his own more extreme heresy, that Acacius endeavoured everywhere to appoint those who professed the doctrine of the consubstantiality. Sozomen attributes the election of Meletius as bishop of Antioch to the Eudoxians, who, he says, first placed him at Sebaste, and to whom, he says, 'it seemed well to transfer Meletius from Sebaste to Antioch, as one who was skilful in speech and in powers of persuasion, good in his manner of life, and hitherto of their own way of thinking. For they altogether hoped by the estimation of the man to entrap into their own heresy the inhabitants of Antioch and the cities round about, and especially those who were called Eustathians, whose doctrine respecting God was according to the tradition in the synod of Nicæa.' St. Jerome records in his Chronicle

In loco citato.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 25, 28.

S. Hieron. Op. omn. t. viii. p. 805, ed. Vallars. Veron. 1740.

that 'Meletius, Bishop of Sebaste, in Armenia, was transferred to Antioch by the Arian Bishops Acacius and George.' The George here mentioned was probably the extreme Arian bishop of Laodicæa.

Thus, though certain Catholic bishops concurred in this election of Meletius, it cannot be denied that, in itself, it was essentially the act of the Arians, who in like manner ejected him at once when he professed the Catholic doctrine. The Catholics were powerless in both instances.

Theodoret is the only one of the early ecclesiastical historians who mentions the concurrence of any of the Catholics, and the only name which he has recorded amongst them, is that of St. Eusebius of Samosata. Father Bollandus, who is himself the author of the 'Life of St. Meletius,' in the work through which his own name has become immortalized, says that St. Eusebius of Samosata attended the assemblies of the heterodox, in order to rescue from heresy any he might be able to rescue, especially such as had fallen rather through ignorance than through malice. He observes that the same St. Eusebius may have been instrumental in the conversion of Meletius.

Bolland Acta Sanctorum. Feb. xii.

Friendly and direct intercourse must undoubtedly have taken place between Meletius and the Catholics referred to, for they were aware of his orthodoxy; at the same time, it is evident that the change which had been effected in him was kept as a secret, for if the Arians had known of it, they would unquestion-

ably have selected some other person as the successor of Eudoxius in Antioch. The transaction is thus related in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Theodoret:— Lib. ii. 31.

'At that time the divine Meletius, bishop of some city in Armenia, being subsequently unable to bear the contumacy of his flock, was living elsewhere in repose. The Arians, surmising (ὑποτοπήσαντες) that he was of one mind with their party, besought Constantius to commit to him the government of the see of Antioch. For, without any restraint, they violated every law, in their endeavours to strengthen their impiety; and the transgression of the laws was the foundation of their blasphemy; and many such innovations they made in many places.[1] But the maintainers of the Apostolic dogmata, both being aware of the soundness in doctrine of the great Meletius, and of course being well acquainted with his holiness of life and richness in virtue, voted with the others, and took the greatest possible care that the act should be written out, and that it should be signed by all; and both one side and the other delivered it as a sort

[1] The essential flaw in the title of Meletius to the see of Antioch was the fact of his having been elected by the Arians, and that as a partaker of their communion. But since the Arians themselves would not account this to be any fault, it is not easy to see in what sense it is implied by Theodoret that they consciously violated the Church's laws in this particular instance. Perhaps he considered them to blame for requesting the interference of the emperor; or he may have intended to allude to the translation (if such it really was) of Meletius from Sebaste to Antioch, which seems to have been one of the charges against him. See Tillemont, Hist. Eccl., note iv. sur S. Melèce.

of mutual compact to the custody of Eusebius, the bishop of the Samosatians, a noble man, a contender for the truth.'

Theod. Eccl. Hist. ii. 32.

When Meletius afterwards declared himself a Catholic, the Arians persuaded the emperor to despatch a messenger in hot haste for the surrender of this document. But St. Eusebius would not give it up, and when threatened, through a second messenger, with the loss of his right hand if he persisted, he held out both his hands to be cut off, repeating his refusal to abandon it. The threat was only intended to terrify, and it was not put into execution. But the firmness of the heroic and faithful bishop excited the admiration of the heretical emperor.

However excellent may have been the motives of these Catholic bishops, they appear to have acted, on this occasion, without any sufficient authority; and their zeal for the advancement of the faith seems to have betrayed them into unlawful communication with the promoters and propagators of heresy. The majority of the Catholics of Antioch exhibited a similar laxity, by mixing in the Arian assemblies, though they did not adopt the Arian tenets. This party raised no objection to the election of Meletius, although the subordinate co-operation in that act of the aforesaid Catholic bishops was insufficient to efface the brand of Arianism, which rendered it invalid in the eyes of the Church.

The Eustathians.

There was, however, an important section of the

faithful in Antioch who would not consent to acknowledge Meletius as their lawful bishop, on account of his connection with the Arians. This party was the only one in the city whose conduct appears to have been in strict accordance with the Church's laws. It was in fact the old Catholic party, and consistent in its line of action as such. It was steadfast in its rejection of the communion of the Arian prelates and their followers, and in its adherence to the rightful claims of the exiled St. Eustathius. Hence this faithful body of Catholics acquired the appellation of *Eustathians*, though totally unconnected with the sect so called after another Bishop Eustathius, of Sebaste. During the thirty years which had elapsed from the period of the unlawful deposition of St. Eustathius of Antioch, to that of the elevation of Meletius to the same see, too many of the Catholics in the city had so far conformed to the altered state of things as to unite with the Arians in their public worship, though Sozomen relates that, whilst they sang psalms together with the Arians, they asserted the Catholic doctrine in the concluding doxology; the others in the same manner giving utterance to their heresy. 'Being arranged,' he says, 'in choirs, as was the custom in singing to God, at the end of the hymns they showed forth their particular opinions. The one party gave glory to Father and Son, as worthy of equal honour; but the other gave glory to the Father in the Son, denoting, by the insertion of the preposition, that

Hist. Eccl. iii. 20.

the Son was inferior to the Father.' The Eustathians would not consent to this species of union without unity. They withstood the seducing influences of an accomplished fact, and, remaining true to their principles, they altogether refused to follow the other Catholics into the churches thus occupied by the Arians. Though a minority, they were numerous and united; and they persevered with an admirable constancy in holding aloof from all communion with the intruded line of bishops, and consequently from Meletius, who formed one of that line, and who owed his election to the authors of it.

Twenty-three years had elapsed since the death of St. Eustathius, when Meletius was elected to Antioch, A.D. 361. It is generally considered that Eustathius died in exile certainly not later than the year 338, but the commonly assigned date is A.D. 337.[1] No successor had been appointed to him as the Catholic bishop of Antioch, but Paulinus was universally recognised to be the leader of the Eustathians, although not elevated above the priesthood for a few

[1] There seems to be no doubt that Socrates (iv. 14.) and Sozomen (vi. 13.) are mistaken in representing St. Eustathius to have been alive, and in Constantinople, at the period of the death of Eudoxius, A.D. 370. They probably confounded him with another Eustathius. Theodoret states positively (iii. 4.) that St. Eustathius of Antioch was dead before the ordination of Meletius, and though the precise date of his decease has not been ascertained, there are sufficient grounds for concluding that it cannot have occurred later than during the year 338. See Tillemont, note v. sur S. Eustathe; Valesius, not. in Socrat. iv. 14; Bolland. Acta Sanct. Jul. xvi.

years subsequent to the election of Meletius. He had received his ordination as priest through the hands of St. Eustathius. His doctrine was unimpeachable, his character was exemplary, and his conduct was untainted by any communion with heretics. He enjoyed the confidence and protection of St. Athanasius, who adhered constantly to his communion and that of the Catholics under his guidance.

St. Athanasius upheld the Eustathians.

Sozom. iii. 20. Socrat. ii. 23. Theod. ii. 12. Rufini Hist. Eccl. x. 19.

When St. Athanasius went to Antioch in the year 349, to meet the Emperor Constantius, who had recalled him from exile, he would have no religious communication with the Arian bishop Leontius, nor with that section of the Catholics who assembled with the Arians in his churches; but he united in communion with the Eustathians, who at that time held their religious assemblies in private houses, and he endeavoured to obtain for them a separate church. It is related that the Arians persuaded the emperor to request St. Athanasius to give up one of the churches of Alexandria to themselves, since they objected to hold communion with him, and that the Saint in wisdom replied, that no one could resist the commands of the emperor, but that in return he had himself to make the petition that one of the churches in Antioch, and, according to Socrates, in every other city also, should be given up for the use of those who objected to communicate with the Arians. Constantius was disposed to assent, but the Arians, perceiving that such an arrangement would not be for their own advantage, preferred to post-

pone the matter, or to let it drop. It does not appear whether a church in Antioch was at that time secured for Paulinus and his followers, but Socrates states that, when Meletius returned to Antioch in the year 362, after his first period of exile, Paulinus was in possession of one of the small churches within the city, from which the newly-intruded Arian bishop Euzoius had not ejected him, out of motives of personal respect.

Hist. Eccles. iii. 9.

The Catholic bishops who took part in the election of Meletius, may have been influenced by the desire of rescuing from communion with the Arians, that majority of their fellow-Catholics in Antioch which had been so unhappily betrayed into it; and they probably entertained the hope that the orthodoxy of the new bishop's sentiments would overcome the objections of the Eustathians; whilst they may have considered that the urgency and the peculiar circumstances of the case afforded sufficient excuse for the irregularity of which they themselves were guilty, in uniting with the Arians for his election. The Arians, on the other hand, believing Meletius to belong to themselves, were sanguine in their expectations that his personal powers of persuasion would win over the Eustathians, as well as many others, to their communion. Judging from the description of Meletius which has come down to us, it cannot be denied that there was ground for these anticipations on both sides; and, as regards the Catholics, their hopes were to some extent justified by the result.

The exceptional character of 'the great Meletius' forms one of the most important features of this altogether exceptional passage in the Church's history. Its lustre was obscured until his noble confession at Antioch, but ever afterwards it shone with a brightness rendered the more brilliant from its contrast with the early mists of error which it had so gloriously dispelled and broken through. The excellence of this remarkable man, after his elevation to the see of Antioch, has been depicted in glowing colours by the most eminent of his contemporaries in the East; and the West has testified her assent by the addition of his name to her martyrology, where it is mentioned with distinction.

Description of St. Meletius.

Ten years after the election of Meletius to Antioch, St. Basil the Great described him as faultless in his faith, and so excellent in his mode of life that none of the others could be compared with him. St. Epiphanius took the part of Paulinus, but he speaks of the honour due to Meletius on account of his high reputation, his excellent morals, his holy and admirable life which was extolled as divine by all men, and which rendered him in every way longed for by the people. Meletius was then in exile.

Epist. lxvii. Athanasio. (ordo novus.)

Hæresis lxxiii. c. 35.

After the decease of Meletius St. Gregory of Nyssa was unsparing in his praises. He reminds his hearers of his sanctity, his struggles for the faith, his chastity, his eloquence. 'You know,' he exclaims, 'what manner of man he was. Noble and high-born from the rising of the sun, blameless, just, true, fearing

Ἐπιτάφιος λόγος εἰς τὸν μέγαν Μελέτιον Ἐπίσκοπον Ἀντιοχείας.

God, and abstaining from all evil.' He recalls 'the sweet serenity of his eyes, the bright smile upon his lips, the affable extension of his right hand, and the fingers so ready to convey the benediction which his mouth pronounced.' He describes his 'eye as bent on heavenly things, his ear as open to the voice of God, his tongue as devoted to the proclamation of divine truth.'

Oratio in laudem S. Meletii. Bolland. Act. SS. xii. Feb.

St. John Chrysostom reminds the people of Antioch how, from the first time that Meletius entered the city, it became a custom for parents to call their children after him, accounting them more dear for the sake of that name, which they looked upon as an ornament and protection, as a safeguard and a solace; as a light amidst darkness, a treasury of innumerable blessings, and a weapon against evil thoughts and desires; so that its sound was heard on all sides, in the streets and in the forum, in the fields and in the roads; and that, not content with this, his image was depicted by many on their rings, their cups, their bowls, and upon the walls of their rooms. He relates how Meletius displayed his meekness and mildness in warding off with his cloak the stones of the indignant populace from the head of the prefect who was bearing him away to exile, on one occasion. He says that 'to gaze on that holy countenance was a source of the greatest delight and enjoyment; for that not only the teaching and conversation, but even the appearance alone, of this blessed man, was

enough to introduce the whole knowledge of virtue into the souls of the beholders.'

St. Gregory Nazianzen, in the poem already referred to, describes Meletius as 'simple, artless in his ways, full of God, calm and confident yet modest in his aspect, showing the culture of the spirit.' He says 'he was what he was called, and he was called what he was—honied in manners and in name.'

Carmen de vitâ suâ, v. 1515, &c.

Μέλιτος γὰρ καὶ τρόπος καὶ τοὔνομα.

'Many things,' he adds, 'did he endure in behalf of the Divine Spirit (though to a slight extent led astray by an alien hand), brightening grace by illustrious combats.'

The historian Theodoret styles him 'the divine Meletius,' the 'meekest of all men;' and Sozomen tells of the goodness of his life and his powers of speech and of persuasion.

Eccl. Hist. v. 3.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 28.

Such proved to be the character of the bishop whom the Arians obtained for the see of Antioch, relying on the assistance of his powerful advocacy for the promotion of their own heresy. Nor is it surprising that those of the orthodox who did not scruple to act in conjunction with them, should have concurred in their election of Meletius, being secretly aware of his conversion to the truth.

The entrance of Meletius into Antioch.

The imperial letters were issued to summon the newly-chosen prelate to Antioch; and, since such was the custom with Constantius, it is to be presumed that he was conveyed on his journey in the

Ammiani Marcellini Lib. xxi. c. 16, n. 18.

public carriages. The report of his gifts and virtues had arrived there before him, and when he reached the city, the ways were thronged with the thousands who had issued forth to meet him. Not only the bishops and priests at that time assembled in Antioch, with all the different ranks of ecclesiastics, but the whole of the people, including even the Jews and pagans, and many of the followers of Paulinus, went out to see the person of the far-famed Meletius; a portion of this mixed multitude being led by curiosity, and others being desirous to hear from him a declaration of his sentiments, for the rumour had now got abroad that he was in favour of the Nicene faith.—'Then,' says St. Gregory of Nyssa, 'the Church of Antioch beheld a countenance formed truly in the image of God; she beheld charity gushing forth as from a fountain; grace diffused upon his lips; the extreme height of humility; one after whom there is nothing more to be imagined. She beheld in him the mildness of David; the understanding of Solomon; the goodness of Moses; the exactitude of Samuel; the chastity of Joseph; the wisdom of Daniel; the zeal for the faith of the great Elias; the bodily purity of the sublime John; the invincible love of Paul. She beheld so great a collection of virtues in this one soul; she was smitten with a blessed love, loving her spouse with a chaste and holy affection!'

Theod. ii. 31. Sozom. iv. 28. Niceph. Callist. ix. 48.

In loco citato.

Even allowing for Eastern hyperbole, no ordinary character could have called forth this encomium.

His public profession of the faith. Eccl. Hist. ii. 31.

Ch. viii. 22.

Theodoret says that the emperor requested Meletius, together with other eminent preachers, to expound to the people a certain text from the Proverbs, which at that time formed one of the special subjects of controversy, and that he appointed practised writers to take down the words of each. George, the Bishop of Laodicæa, was the first to speak, and he vomited forth the ill savour of poisonous heresy. Acacius of Cæsarea followed next, and he framed his speech in a middle course, avoiding the blasphemy of the extreme party, but not retaining the pure and genuine mark of Apostolic doctrine. After these arose Meletius, and he boldly set forth the rule of truth, unhesitatingly making manifest the orthodoxy of his belief. Loud were the applauses of the Catholics, and great was the confusion of the heretics. According to Sozomen, it was said that the archdeacon of the clergy of Antioch rushed up to Meletius in fury, and stopped his mouth; upon which Meletius, holding up at first three of his fingers and then only one, proclaimed the same faith still more clearly by this action, than he had previously done by his words so long as his voice was free. The archdeacon then hastening to seize upon his hand, involuntarily set at liberty his lips, and so enabled Meletius again to give verbal testimony to the faith. He proclaimed it still more strongly and more plainly than before, loudly exhorting his hearers to maintain steadfastly the doctrines of Nicæa, and protesting that such as were otherwise minded erred concerning the truth.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 28.

Whilst Meletius was thus preaching the Catholic faith, by speech and by gesture alternately, as the violence of the archdeacon allowed him, 'the Eustathians,' proceeds Sozomen, 'cried out aloud and leaped for joy, but the Arians were downcast.' Theodoret does not mention the story of this unseemly conduct of the archdeacon, but he says that the multitude greatly applauded the sermon of Meletius, and entreated him to give them a compendium of his teaching, upon which, 'displaying three fingers, then closing two of them and leaving one extended, he uttered the praiseworthy sentence — "There are three understood by the mind, but we reason as of one: Τρία τὰ νοούμενα· ὡς ἑνὶ δὲ διαλεγόμεθα."'

Eccl. Hist. ii. 31.

Euzoius made Arian Bishop of Antioch. Theod. ii. 31. Sozom. iv. 28. Socrat. ii. 44. Philostorg. v. 5.

The Arians at first endeavoured to induce Meletius to retract his profession of the Catholic faith. But finding that he remained firm, and that he would in no wise alter his sentiments, they persuaded the Emperor to expel him from the church, and he was banished to his own country, Melitene, when scarce thirty days had elapsed since his public entry into Antioch as its newly-elected bishop. The archheretic Euzoius, the friend of Arius, and who, when a deacon in Alexandria, had been condemned together with him by St. Alexander then archbishop of that see, was now summoned by the emperor and thrust into the bishopric of Antioch; the whole being the work of those selfsame persons, who had been foremost in the choice of Meletius when they supposed him to entertain their own opinions.

Theodoret says that the accusation now made against Meletius was that of the profession of Sabellianism. It was a charge which the Arians very frequently brought against the orthodox; but in the present instance their principal motive may have been that which is mentioned by their own partisan, Philostorgius, who relates that 'Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, was banished by Constantius, who was then residing at Antioch, to his own country, Melitene, as being convicted of perjury, and because that "whilst going out of his way he set forth the *homoousion*, he conformed himself to the *heterousion*" (τὸ ὁμοούσιον πρεσβεύων ἐκτόπως, τὸ ἑτερούσιον κατεσχηματίζεται).' It is not easy to acquit Meletius from the reproach of duplicity before his election to the see of Antioch; or to justify his acceptance of that bishopric at the hands of the Arians, whilst he allowed them at the same time to assume that he was one of themselves. Nor is it surprising that they should have been filled with indignation, and have been eager to depose him, when they discovered the mistake which they had made.

Accusations against Meletius. In loc. citat.

In loc. citat.

The above-mentioned sermon of Meletius has been preserved by St. Epiphanius in his celebrated work against heresies. It commences with the praise of peace and an exhortation to love God and keep His commandments, and afterwards it proceeds to speak of doctrine. After reciting this discourse at length, St. Epiphanius says that the Arians, now finding Meletius to be 'an offence to them instead of a source

His sermon.

Hæres. lxxiii. 29, &c.

Ibid. c. 34.

of joy and repose,' stirred up the emperor and turned him out of the bishopric; adding that he was carried off into banishment by night, and was then still living[1] in exile in his own country, honoured and prized both on account of what he had accomplished, and of the true and genuine faith which was maintained by his flock in Antioch. In a subsequent passage, St. Epiphanius observes respecting this sermon of Meletius, that there are found in it two or three reprehensible sayings, though he does not know whether they escaped unnoticed in the excitement of preaching, or whether they arose out of the simplicity of the preacher's mind.

Ibid. c. 35.

St. Jerome, in the opening page of his continuation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, names Meletius simply as one of the intruded Arian line, remarking that he should consider them 'rather as the enemies of Christ than as bishops;' and in a subsequent passage, after stating that Meletius was transferred to Antioch by the Arian bishops, Acacius and George, he says, that not long after, having 'received priests who had been deposed by his predecessor, Eudoxius, he gave a false colouring to a most just cause of exile by a sudden change of faith (*exilii justissimam causam subita fidei mutatione delusit*).' St. Jerome appears to have derived this information from the people of

Op. omn. t. viii. p. 785, ed. citat.

Ibid. p. 805

[1] Meletius had returned from his first banishment several years before this account of it was written by St. Epiphanius, but he had again been banished twice, and was then undergoing his third and last period of exile. See Tillemont, note vi. sur S. Melèce.

whom St. Epiphanius says that he cannot tell whether they were carried away by hatred or envy, or whether they wished to advance their own cause, but that they insinuated certain things, such as that the movement against Meletius was not on account of his orthodoxy, but because, they said, of canonical matters and trouble between himself and his clergy, and because he received some whom he had previously rejected and anathematized. St. Epiphanius adds, that he paid no regard at all to these things, chiefly because of the ensuing daily amendment amongst the followers of Meletius, and their confession of the faith. There was a subsequent charge against the orthodoxy of Meletius, which was equally unfounded. Hæres. lxxiii. 35.

It is essential to bear in mind the currency of such stories at the time, as well as the acknowledged previous connection of Meletius with the Arians, in order to form a just estimate of the conduct of Rome and the West, under the very perplexing combination of circumstances which ensued. The early errors of Meletius were nobly atoned for; and the later charges against him were doubtless misrepresentations; but it must be remembered that, however unjust the accusations might be, they would wear a greater semblance of truth from the fact of his culpable antecedents, and that the conflicting evidence, and the circumstances of the times, rendered it extremely difficult for persons in a distant country to arrive quickly at a positive conclusion.

The ways of Providence are inscrutable, but God

acts through human means, and, as is suggested by Tillemont, it may have been in expiation of the faults of his youth that St. Meletius was permitted to remain for the greater part of his life, without any formal and express acknowledgment of his ecclesiastical position on the part of the see of Rome; and that he never enjoyed direct and formal episcopal communion with St. Athanasius; for although at one time he seemed on the point of it, it was unaccountably postponed, and that illustrious confessor was called to his reward above, before the position of St. Meletius in Antioch had been universally recognised.

The change effected in Antioch.

The expectations of the Catholics were in no small degree fulfilled through the benefits which religion derived from the election of Meletius to Antioch. St. John Chrysostom reminds the people of that city how, during the short interval of the thirty days, or less, which elapsed between his entrance and his exile, he had succeeded in cutting off from the Church corrupt and incurable members, and in restoring health to the multitude; and how he had so firmly implanted the truth in the hearts of the faithful, that it was not henceforth to be rooted up by the violence of future storms, or corrupted through the subtlety of future temptations. He had completely won over those many Catholics whom he had found in outward communion with the Arians, but who returned to them no more after the banishment of Meletius. Such of the faithful as acknowledged him for their bishop, rejected with firmness the

Oratio in laudem S. Meletii.

Rufin. x. 24. Theod. ii. 31; iii. 4. Vales. annot. in loc. Socrat. ii. 44. Sozom. iv. 28. Tillemont, s. Vital et S. Philogone.

communion of the newly-intruded Euzoius, and assembled apart for their religious worship in the old church of the old town, which was at that time a suburb outside the city gates, and was called the Palæa (ἡ παλαιά), on account of its antiquity. The church appears to have been frequently designated by the same title, though Theodoret styles it the 'Apostolic Church,' and it is said to have occupied the place of a church of apostolic origin, in which the chair of St. Peter was first established.

The Eustathians remain apart, though the Meletians confess the same faith.

Theod. iii. 4. Socrat. ii. 44. Sozom. iv. 28. Niceph. Callist. ix. 48.

The Eustathians, under their priest Paulinus, held aloof from Meletius, whilst they rejected Euzoius; and, in fact, neither the present orthodoxy of the former, nor yet his sufferings in behalf of the faith and noble confession of the Nicene Creed, were sufficient of themselves to remedy the essential invalidity of his election by the Arians, until the application of the formal indulgence accorded for such cases by the subsequent council of Alexandria. It was on this account, together, it was said, with some hesitation respecting Arian baptism, that the Eustathians could not be persuaded to unite with the Catholics under Meletius, though they were at one with them respecting the faith. 'One,' says Theodoret, 'was the confession of faith on both sides. For each party contended for the doctrine expounded at Nicæa.' Socrates states, that after the banishment of Meletius, 'those who retained their disposition towards him, abandoning the congregation of the Arians, held their assemblies by themselves;' those who had believed in

the *homoousion* from the first being unwilling to communicate with them, 'because Meletius had been ordained through the vote of the Arians, and because his followers had been baptized by them.' 'In this way,' he adds, 'the church in Antioch also was divided into two parts, each of them holding one and the same doctrine.' Sozomen says precisely the same. Nicephorus Callistus, who, though a more recent author, sometimes throws light on the ancient historians, states that 'though both sides were united in doctrine, yet they were separated on the sole account of the election of Meletius.' In the preceding sentence, however, he mentions also the Arian baptism as one of the grounds of separation. This would appear to have been an unfounded objection, if it really was made; otherwise it could hardly have failed to have been noticed in the subsequent letter from the council of Alexandria to the Antiochians, which makes no mention of it.

Return of the exiled bishops.

The first exile of Meletius was not of long duration. The Emperor Constantius died towards the close of the year 361, and his successor, the apostate Julian, permitted all bishops then in banishment for religion, to return to the occupation of their sees. According to the pagan historian, he wished to leave the Christians to their internal dissensions that he might have the less to fear from the unanimity of the people. Meletius therefore was recalled from Melitene, in Armenia, to which he had been banished, and he returned to Antioch in the year

Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 5.

362. The same event released also the two great Western bishops, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari, from their exile in the Upper Thebais. Lucifer had been one of the papal legates at the council of Milan in the year 355. Eusebius of Vercelli had joined the apostolic legates on that occasion, and had taken a prominent part in the proceedings. Together with the papal legates he had distinguished himself in the council by his firmness in refusing to communicate with the Arians, or to condemn St. Athanasius in his absence; he had been banished in consequence, as well as Lucifer and others, and he had suffered incredible hardships.

Baron. Annal. Eccl. an. 355.

The division between the Catholics of Antioch could not fail to prove a source of grief and of solicitude to these holy confessors, as well as to the universal body of the orthodox, and it formed an object of special attention in the important synod which was held at Alexandria in the year 362.

Efforts to reunite the Catholics of Antioch.

Cardinal Baronius considers that the Pope Liberius was the author and promoter of this synod, in his anxiety to repair the damages which the Catholic cause had sustained at Rimini. There are stronger reasons for supposing this to have been the case than those which are adduced by the learned cardinal.

Annal. Eccles. an. 362, nn. clxxvii. ccvi.

The same eminent author is further of opinion that Eusebius, the bishop of Vercelli, and Lucifer, the bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, were nominated by the Pope as his legates for the above-named Alexan-

The legations of Eusebius and Lucifer.

drian council, and he also considers that the active and prominent part which was taken by these noble and indefatigable warriors of Christ in behalf of the Catholic cause throughout the East, and particularly by Lucifer in the affairs of Antioch, was in virtue of the same legatine authority. The conduct of these two Western prelates, and the manner in which their assistance was universally received and accepted, are plain indications that they were entrusted by the Apostolic See with powers of extraordinary jurisdiction and authority in the East; nor is there wanting more direct evidence in justification of this conclusion. It must be observed, that De Marca is of opinion that they acted in virtue of former legatine faculties not yet become extinct. Thomassin refers to him, and adopts the same view. But this explanation is unsatisfactory, to say the least. The *dignity* conferred by the office would certainly remain in a lesser degree attached to the person of the bearer after the office itself had ceased. But the ecclesiastical *faculties* given with it, could only continue for the period and the purpose for which they had originally been granted. It seems hardly probable that the powers delegated by the Pope to his representatives in a Western council, should have extended so far as to confer upon them future authority in questions which had not then arisen, and future jurisdiction over Eastern churches, which, at that time, there was no idea of their visiting. Moreover, it does not appear that Eusebius was ever constituted one of the papal

De concord. Sacerd. et Imp. v. 15.

Discip. de l'Église, P. i. L. ii. ch. cxvii. 8.

legates at Milan, though he was undoubtedly most closely associated with the previous cognate embassy from the Pope to Constantius in Gaul. This embassy occurred in the year 354, after the lapse, which happily proved but temporary, of the Pope's legate, Vincentius of Capua, and its object was to obtain the consent of the emperor for the celebration of a council, which was held in the following year at Milan. The legates originally appointed by Liberius for this embassy were Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, the priest Pancratius, and the deacon Hilarius. Eusebius of Vercelli, was himself a native of Sardinia, which would form a further motive for his union with Lucifer, in addition to the burning zeal for the faith which filled the hearts of both. Liberius wrote expressly to Eusebius to solicit him to accompany his legates to Constantius, and the language of the Pope makes manifest how highly he estimated the virtues of the holy Bishop of Vercelli. He greets Eusebius with an earnest expression of the consolation he had derived from his unconquered faith, 'by which,' says the Pope, 'following the precepts of the Gospels, thou hast in no way deviated from the fellowship of the Apostolic See. *Me, frater carissime, ad solatium vitæ præsentis erigit invicta fides tua, qua secutus Evangeliorum præcepta, nullo genere, a consortio sedis apostolicæ discrepasti.*' In a subsequent letter he more especially commends to Eusebius the above-named legates, begging of him to accompany them on their mission, to unite himself to their fellow-

Coustant. coll. 422, 7, 8. Epist. Liberii Papæ iii. v. vii.

ship, that, wherever it may be, he may be also, and that 'united in conference and in counsel, they may perform that which is pleasing to God and His angels, and expedient for the Catholic Church.' Eusebius replied with an assent to the request, upon which the Pope honoured him with another letter, expressive of his satisfaction, and of his confidence that the cause would be more prosperous since Eusebius would not desert his brethren, and he bade him to 'labour as a good soldier who expects the reward of the eternal Emperor.' 'Holding,' adds the Pope, 'this life in contempt, show yourself a truth-speaking priest, that through your joint labours for the state of the Church the council may be celebrated.' It is therefore evident that Eusebius was formally associated by Liberius with his legates in this embassy to Constantius, and that, in this way, a special legation was, on that occasion, entrusted to him, although he is not mentioned in the letter sent by the Pope to the emperor through Lucifer, in which the names of the other legates are expressly enumerated. It does not, however, appear that Eusebius occupied the office of a papal legate in the council which was convened during the subsequent year at Milan. At the first he hesitated to attend it, but his presence being especially solicited by the synod and the emperor, as well as by the papal legates, he ultimately went up to the council in company with the legates, and distinguished himself in union with them by his courageous defence of the Nicene faith.

Coustant. col. 423.

Baron. Ann. Eccl. an. 355.

The epistle sent by Liberius to Eusebius and Lucifer, together with Dionysius, during their subsequent exile in the East, contains no instructions on ecclesiastical matters. But it is supposed to have been written in the very year of their banishment, A.D. 355, seven years previous to the synod of Alexandria now in question, and it is impossible to say what subsequent communications may have been transmitted to Eusebius and Lucifer, from Rome, either through letters now lost, or orally through confidential messengers. The difficulties of the times and the consequent importance of secrecy frequently rendered it unadvisable to entrust such matters to writing; and this circumstance, together with the loss of documents to an extent of which we can form no idea, will account for our ignorance respecting many perplexing passages in the Church's early history. A candid enquirer after truth will not refuse to explain any such doubtful point according to the established constitution of the Church, and her existing laws and customs, rather than appeal to it as a ground for disbelieving in them, or as an excuse for disobeying them.

Ep. vii. Coustant. col. 429.

Historical testimony to their legations.

In the instance before us, however, we are in possession of positive historical evidence as to the fact of the legations of Eusebius and Lucifer in the East, though we have not any record of the time or the manner in which they were conferred upon them. Father Papebrochius, in the Bollandist life of Lucifer of Cagliari, gives the following words, as

Acta Sanctorum, Die xx Maii, c.v. n. 45.

attributed to St. Honoratus, who was a disciple of St. Eusebius, and the second successor to his bishopric. The words are taken from a life of St. Eusebius preserved in the archives of Vercelli, and they may be literally translated as follows:—'St. Eusebius was present and presided in the Alexandrian council with Athanasius, and he had four legations, one to Constantius with Lucifer the Sardinian; another with the same to the Alexandrian synod; another, after the synod, to the Oriental Churches; the fourth, afterwards, into the West. But the first three he had with Lucifer, the last indeed alone, without any companion.' Papebrochius appears to think it questionable whether these words really came from St. Honoratus. However this may be, they bear internal evidence of their accuracy, in the fact that they do not ascribe to Eusebius any legation to the council of Milan, which a careless or unscrupulous eulogist would certainly have been apt to do. To say the least, the document must be accepted in evidence of the local tradition of the period to which it belongs, and, unless proved to be a forgery, of which there does not appear to be any suspicion, its authority cannot reasonably be set aside; especially since the statement which it contains, derives confirmation from the conduct of Eusebius and Lucifer in the East, as recorded in ecclesiastical history. Had they acted as they did without authority from the Roman Pontiff, they would have grievously violated the laws of the Church, and not only the eastern

bishops would have loudly protested against their interference and denounced their proceedings, but Rome herself would have been foremost in condemning them.

The course pursued by Eusebius and Lucifer. Theod. iii. 4, 5. Socrat. iii. 5, 6, 7. Sozom. v. 12. Rufin. i. (x.) 27.

When Eusebius and Lucifer were released from their exile, they took counsel between themselves, and with others of the orthodox, respecting the means to be adopted for the reinforcement of the ecclesiastical laws and the restoration of peace to the church, especially as regarded Antioch, which occupied the first position in the East, and where, in the words of Theodoret, 'the sound body of the church was separated into two parts.' It was finally decided for Lucifer to proceed to Antioch, and for Eusebius to go to Alexandria, 'in order,' says Socrates, 'that, together with Athanasius, having assembled a synod, the dogmata of the church might be strengthened.' He afterwards states that, 'when Eusebius had reached Alexandria, he quickly, along with Athanasius, called together the synod.' Sozomen says the same. We learn, however, from Theodoret and Rufinus, that Eusebius at the first asked Lucifer to accompany him to Alexandria, but that Lucifer would not accede to his request, being intent on the settlement of the affairs of Antioch. He sent, however, his deacon to the synod in his stead, and agreed to acquiesce through him in its acts. The historians speak of one deacon only as sent by Lucifer, though the letter from the synod to the Antiochians expressly gives the names of two.

The two bishops, Cymatius of Paltus, and Anatolius of Eubœa, are associated with Lucifer and the others in the address of the same letter, and since they are not named as present in the council, they may perhaps have accompanied Lucifer to Antioch, or may have met him in that city.

Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362.' Hist. Eccl. i. (x.) 28.

This celebrated synod of Alexandria is described by Rufinus as a 'council of confessors, few in number, but perfect in faith, and many in merits.' Besides giving their attention to such points of doctrine as required it, without adding to what was done at Nicæa, the assembled bishops applied themselves especially to deliberate upon the best measures to be taken for the restoration of tranquillity throughout the church, and for the reparation of the damage which had been sustained through the Arians. They had before them a question of incalculable importance respecting the manner in which converts returning from heresy were to be dealt with, and particularly as to whether such as had received ordination, were to be admitted according to their rank amongst the Catholic clergy. There were those whose zeal for the faith led them to counsel that, though the orders could not be forfeited, such persons should be suspended from the ecclesiastical office as unworthy. Others more imbued with apostolic charity maintained, that those who had remained steadfast should stoop to lift up the fallen, and should humble themselves in order to recover the feeble who had been led astray. Such was the

course best suited to the interests of the Christian people in general, who would have been strongly opposed to any measure which, on account of a culpable weakness now lamented, would have severed from them pastors whom they loved, and whom they knew to have renounced their error. After careful discussion the side of mercy was preferred, at the same time that a just distinction was drawn between the deceivers and the deceived. Pardon was proclaimed for all who penitently sought for reconciliation; but such as had been chiefs and leaders among the heretics were not to be admitted to a place amongst the clergy. Those, however, who had fallen through violence or surprise, and now repented of their error, were to be admitted not only to pardon, but were also to be received to their rank amongst the clergy, particularly, says St. Athanasius, since such persons alleged in excuse that they had yielded to the Arians in order to prevent the corruption of the church and the ruin of the people, through the appointment of most impious pastors in their stead. All who came back from heresy, or from communion with heretics, were further required to make a profession of the faith of Nicæa, and to anathematize the contrary errors. This wise and salutary indulgence thus conceded by the assembled bishops, was universally approved and welcomed, and it was confirmed by the authority of the Roman See. St. Jerome declared it to be the salvation of the church. 'The West,' he says,

St. Athanas. Epist. ad Rufinianum.

Dialog. advers. Luciferianos, n. 20.

'assented to this decision, and by this so necessary council the world was rescued from the jaws of Satan.'

The case of Meletius.

The principle on which this concession was grounded, applied manifestly to the position of Meletius and his friends. We have evidence that such was the traditional opinion at Rome, in the appeal which was made to the case as a precedent by the papal legate in the seventh general council, the second of Nicæa, A.D. 787. The same question of the reception of repentant heretics being then under discussion, and various authorities being produced in testimony of the former practice of the church, it is recorded in the acts of the said council, that—

Hard. Act. Concil. t. iv. coll. 63, 64.

'Peter the priest, most dear to God, and representative of Adrian the most holy Pope of Rome, said, "As say the historians, the holy Meletius was ordained by the Arians, and he ascended the ambo and proclaimed the homoousion, and the ordination was not rejected."

'Theodore, the most holy Bishop of Catana, and they who were with him, the bishops of Sicily, said, "The archpriest of the apostolic chair has spoken truly."

'Tarasius, the most holy patriarch, said, "In nothing do we find the holy fathers disagreeing,"' &c. &c.

But besides the concession of the indulgence in general, and its consequent application to Meletius, the position of the church in Antioch called for and received the particular attention of the bishops as-

sembled in Alexandria. They carefully examined the questions connected with it, and the conclusions at which they arrived were summed up, after many of the bishops had departed for their dioceses, by those who were left in Alexandria, in a letter replete with the spirit of wisdom and charity, and which appears to have been written by St. Athanasius himself. Besides being found in the collections of the councils, this letter is published amongst the works of St. Athanasius, under the title, Ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀντιοχεῖς τόμος Ἀθανασίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας.

T. i. p. ii. p. 615. ed. Patav. 1777.

The tome of St. Athanasius to the Antiochians.

It is stated at the close of the epistle that it was written to the five following bishops:—'Eusebius, of Vercelli, a city of Gaul;[1] Lucifer, of the island of Sardinia; Asterius, of Petra in Arabia; Cymatius, of Paltus in Cœlesyria; and Anatolius, of Eubœa.' It is observable that precedence is here given to the names of Eusebius and Lucifer, and after them to that of Asterius, who was to accompany Eusebius to Antioch. It is also stated that those who sent the epistle were—'Pope Athanasius and those who were with him in Alexandria, Eusebius himself, and Asterius, and the rest,' whose names then follow. Eusebius and Asterius, having assisted at the council, were numbered amongst the bishops who sent the letter; though, being also entrusted with the execution of the decrees, they were necessarily at the same time included amongst those to whom it was

[1] That is to say, of Cisalpine Gaul, a part of Italy.

addressed. In a preceding paragraph it is mentioned that the document was also subscribed by the two deacons sent to the Council by Lucifer, as well as by two other deacons from Paulinus, who, though only a priest, was thus represented at the synod, as the head of the acknowledged Catholic party in Antioch, the bishopric being, strictly speaking, vacant.[1] There is no express mention of Meletius, nor of his having been in any way represented in the council.

Commencement of the epistle.

The bishops in Alexandria commenced the letter by expressing their confidence in the ability of the bishops they were addressing to set in order all the affairs of the Church, but added, that they considered it necessary to write as they did in

[1] Baronius (an. 362, nn. 180, 215, 216.) considers that Paulinus, before sending his deacons to the council of Alexandria, had been consecrated bishop by Lucifer, and that the council approved of his consecration. Valesius also thinks (Annot. in Socrat. Hist. Eccl. iii. 5) that the consecration of Paulinus by Lucifer preceded the mission of the deacons to the council. But this opinion appears to be untenable. It does not accord with the circumstances related by the early historians, and it is also at variance with the whole tenor of the letter of the same synod to the Antiochians. That document mentions Paulinus and his party, but it never speaks of him as a bishop. He is not styled brother, or fellow-minister, by its authors in any portion of it. It assigns him no part in the task of the reception of the converts from heresy or from heretical communion, which was one that belonged essentially to the office of the bishop. If, at the time when the epistle was written, the bishops who sent it had been aware of and had approved the consecration of Paulinus, they would certainly have expressly recognised his episcopal rank, and they would have included his name amongst those of the bishops they were addressing. See Tillemont, Hist. Eccl. t. vii. note ii. sur Lucifer de Cagliari; also, Pagi, Not. in Baron. Annal. Eccl. in loc. citat.

consequence of the good tidings which had reached them, that many formerly separated from them through party spirit (διὰ φιλονεικίαν) were now desirous for reconciliation, and that many also were abandoning the Arian heresy, and seeking their communion. They say that they wish they could join the other bishops in person, but that, as they have stated in other letters, they are prevented by the necessities of the church, and they express their gratitude to Eusebius and Asterius, who, instead of returning to their own dioceses, have agreed at their request to proceed to Antioch in their place, on account of the church's urgent need, adding,—'We are consoled by their consent, because when they and yourselves are there, we account ourselves all to be present with you.'

Instructions respecting Antioch.

The epistle then proceeds:—'Call to you all therefore who desire to make peace with us, and *especially those who assemble in the Palæa*' (the Meletians), 'and those who fly from the Arians, and receive them as fathers would receive their sons, and as their teachers and guides accept them back, and, uniting them to our beloved Paulinus and those who are with him (συνάψαντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν τοῖς περὶ Παυλῖνον), demand nothing more from them than to anathematize the heresy of the Arians, and to profess the faith professed by the holy fathers at Nicæa,' and to anathematize also the existing heresies against the Holy Ghost, with those of Sabellius and others. 'When these things are done,' add the

fathers, 'all evil suspicion will be removed on all sides, and there will be shown forth only the pure faith of the Catholic Church.' After observing that no one can be ignorant that they themselves, as well as those who have always been in communion with them, hold the same faith, the Alexandrian fathers say again:—'Since, then, we rejoice with those who desire to be united with us, with all such indeed, but especially with those who assemble in the Palæa, and we have very exceedingly given glory to the Lord, both on account of all, and because of the good purpose of these, we exhort you that concord may be established on these conditions, and that nothing more than these, as we have before said, be required by you of those who assemble in the Palæa; and that Paulinus and his party put forward nothing different, and nothing more than was put forward at Nicæa.' They declare that a certain writing attributed to the Council of Sardica is spurious, and not to be acknowledged or brought forward at all, nor yet anything else besides the Nicene profession of faith.

The question of the Hypostases.

The fathers then pass on to treat of the difference concerning the Hypostases. They state that, having examined into the doctrine of those who were accused of Arianism because they maintained that there were three divine Hypostases, it became evident that the term was applied by them to the Divine Persons, and that they acknowledged the unity of the Divine Substance; and that having afterwards questioned the others who were charged with Sabellianism because

they maintained one only hypostasis in the Godhead, they found that the term was applied by them to the Divine Substance, and that they never intended to deny that there were three distinct and Divine Persons in the one God. Thus, both these parties were found to unite in the Catholic doctrine, and merely to differ respecting the application of the term, and both of them alike anathematized Arius, and Sabellius, and the other heretics. 'After these explanations,' proceeds the letter, 'all, by the grace of God, agreed that the profession of faith of the fathers at Nicæa was better and more accurate than terms of this kind, and that for the future they ought in preference to be satisfied with the words of that council, and to make use of them.'

Exhortation to avoid idle questions.

After treating of another point, which was connected with the Apollinarian heresy, and which concerned the doctrine of the Incarnation, the fathers in Alexandria earnestly exhorted the bishops they were addressing, to dissuade the people from entertaining mere questions about words, and as faithful servants and stewards of the Lord, to prevent all such occasions of offence and of discord, and to prefer peace to everything of the kind, provided the faith was sound.

Conclusion of the epistle.

Finally, they gave directions to the said bishops to read the letter in public, in the place where they were accustomed to assemble in Antioch, and to have all men called there to them. 'For it is right,' said the fathers, 'that the epistle should first be read there, and that there those who wish and seek for peace

should be united with one another; and afterwards when they are united together, that the assemblies should be concluded wherever it may be pleasing to all the people, your excellencies being present, and that the Lord should be glorified by all in common.' The salutation which then follows appears to indicate that the letter was written by St. Athanasius, in the name of the other bishops:—'The brethren who are with me salute you. I pray that you may be well, and that you will make mention of us to the Lord. I Athanasius: likewise the other bishops assembled together have subscribed,' &c. Eusebius further subscribed separately to a short Latin form of acquiescence in the decision respecting the Hypostases, and other points connected with the faith, to which Asterius added his assent. There is also subjoined to the document a subsequent profession of faith from Paulinus.

Hist. Eccl. i. (x.) 29.

It is stated by Rufinus that, after the bishops had arrived at their decision, by a decree of the council the charge (*procuratio*) of the East, was committed to Asterius and those who were with him, and that of the West, to Eusebius. This, no doubt, refers to the promulgation of the acts of the synod. But nothing more is heard of Asterius. It is conjectured that he may have died immediately afterwards, and it appears from subsequent events that Eusebius took charge of the matter in the East, as well as in the West.

Tillemont, Hist. Eccl. St. Athanase. art. xcix.

In addition to its general importance, this letter is

Remarks upon the letter.

particularly valuable as a testimony to the judgment of leading Catholic bishops of the day, including the great St. Athanasius, upon the position of ecclesiastical affairs in Antioch at the period when it was written. It is especially to be observed that this letter distinctly recognised Paulinus and those under him, as forming the Catholic body in Antioch, and that it required the others to be united with them before any further step was taken. But no sort of submission was required to Paulinus individually, nor were his personal claims in any way put forward. It is also to be remarked that the letter contained no allusion to Meletius or to the question of the bishopric. But so soon as the reconciliation had been effected, the choice of the church for the concluding thanksgiving was to be left to the people in general. They were therefore left at liberty to select the church occupied by the Meletians, and, provided Paulinus and his party had consented, the fathers would, in all probability, have rejoiced to have seen all the Catholics of Antioch united under Meletius as their bishop, after he had fulfilled the few and easy conditions which were imposed by the council. At the same time they would not be disposed to press such an arrangement upon the Eustathians against their will, out of deference to their long and unswerving fidelity, and to their position as the old Catholic party; a position which rendered the case of Antioch peculiar and exceptional, and, in fact, which constituted the difficulty. It is evident, how-

ever, from the above-cited epistle, that the Meletians were desirous to be reconciled with the great Catholic body, and if all parties had been guided by the spirit which prevailed in the council, it may reasonably be supposed that some mode would have been discovered of terminating the local dissension, especially since any necessary concessions for the sake of peace, might have been hoped for from one of the character of Meletius. But an event which had occurred without the knowledge of the synod, rendered fruitless all its endeavours for a speedy reconciliation.

Lucifer consecrates Paulinus.

The ardent zeal of the enthusiastic and severe Lucifer, could not brook the delay which was calculated to prove most conducive to the successful accomplishment of his mission; nor could he curb his natural eagerness into the patience which appears to have been called for by the circumstances, involving as they did many obvious considerations of charity and of wisdom. Whilst the bishops were deliberating at Alexandria, Lucifer was acting at Antioch. Without waiting for the decisions of the council, or even for the assistance of his more aged and more prudent, but certainly no less devoted colleague St. Eusebius, he freely exercised the authority which had been delegated to him.

Theod. iii. 5.
Socrat. iii. 6.
Sozom. v. 12.
Rufin. i. (x.) 27.

Apparently wearied with the fruitlessness of the repeated discourses upon concord, by which at first he had vainly endeavoured to reconcile the divided Catholics of Antioch, and finding the Eustathians to

be firm in the maintenance of their claims, he consecrated bishop their leader Paulinus, having obtained the assistance of two other bishops for the purpose, as is mentioned by St. Jerome, who thus records it in his Chronicle:—'Eusebius and Lucifer return from exile, of whom Lucifer, two other confessors[1] being procured, makes bishop on the Catholic side at Antioch, Paulinus, presbyter of bishop Eustathius, who had never defiled himself by communion with heretics.' Meletius had not yet returned to Antioch from his place of banishment, and it is possible that Lucifer wished to anticipate that event. The personal excellence of Paulinus does not appear to have been called in question. But in one respect this even tended to an increase of the difficulty; because it strengthened the claims of the Eustathians, which, on the one hand could not be set aside, and on the other, could not be acknowledged so fully as strict justice might have required, without the exercise of an undue and repulsive severity towards Meletius and his followers who were desirous for reconciliation. At the very moment when mutual concessions might have healed and terminated the schism, it was aggravated and prolonged through this mistaken zeal of Lucifer. Theo-

Op. omn. t. viii. p. 805, ed. citat.

[1] It is stated in a note on this passage that Scaliger found the names of these two bishops in a very ancient codex, given as *Gorgonius de Germania* (qy. *Germanicia*, in Syria?), and *Cymatius de Gabala*. Tillemont thinks this may have been the same Cymatius who was one of the five to whom the letter was addressed from Alexandria, and who was therein styled, *of Paltus*, which was not far from Gabala. Tillemont, Lucif. de Cagl. iv.

doret says, that Lucifer, 'not doing well (οὐκ εὖγε ποιῶν),' consecrated Paulinus bishop for the Eustathians. 'This,' he adds, 'prolonged that dissension, for it lasted for five-and-eighty years,' &c. He counts from the time of the banishment of St. Eustathius, A.D. 330–1. Rufinus says that the two dissentient Catholic parties in Antioch were hoping that unity might be restored, if such a bishop could be chosen for them as would prove agreeable not only to one side but to both, when Lucifer, 'in over haste (*præproperus*) made Paulinus bishop, a Catholic indeed and a holy man, and in all respects worthy of the episcopate, but yet one in whom both parties amongst the people could not acquiesce.'

Eusebius arrives in Antioch.

Socrat. iii. 9. Sozom. v. 13. Rufin. i. (x.) 30. Theod. iii. 5.

When the proceedings of the council had terminated in Alexandria, St. Eusebius of Vercelli went immediately to Antioch. On learning what had been done there, he was greatly distressed, and declined to acknowledge either party. According to Rufinus, he had visited that city before the council was assembled, and had led the people to anticipate from it a satisfactory termination of their dissensions. He was greatly disturbed that the rashness of Lucifer should have frustrated these designs of peace. Rufinus thus relates the occurrence:—'But when Eusebius returned to Antioch, and found a bishop ordained there by Lucifer, contrary to what was promised, driven off both by shame and indignation, he departed, opening his communion to neither side, because when he went away from thence, he had

promised that he would bring it to pass in the council that such a bishop should be ordained for them as would be declined by neither party.' It appears, however, from Socrates and Sozomen, that Eusebius did not leave Antioch till he had made every possible exertion to unite the divided parties, but unhappily without success. At length, 'perceiving,' says Theodoret, 'that the evil had become well-nigh incurable through faulty treatment,' he went away, after proclaiming to both sides that the position of affairs should be set straight in a synod of bishops. The respect which he entertained for Lucifer deterred him from giving vent in public to any expression of his displeasure. Eusebius, together with the other bishops, had recognised the communion of Paulinus and his party in the letter from the Alexandrian synod, and it is therefore evident that in holding aloof from it on his arrival in Antioch, he was actuated by the strong disapprobation with which he regarded the consecration of a bishop in whom both parties could not agree, and probably also by the desire of making it known that he had not himself consented to the act. Lucifer was very greatly offended and displeased in consequence, but it would lead me too far from my subject to enter on his future history, which is involved in great obscurity.[1]

[1] According to ancient historians, the above-mentioned difference respecting the consecration of Paulinus, gave rise to the subsequent schism of the Luciferians, who separated themselves

The position of Paulinus.

Though no question could arise as to the validity of the episcopal order conferred upon Paulinus by his consecration, a very serious question might arise respecting the validity of his jurisdiction. Had Lucifer acted as a simple bishop without extraordinary faculties, he could have given the orders, but he could not have given jurisdiction. He could have made Paulinus a bishop, but he could not have made him bishop of Antioch. It cannot, however, be supposed for a moment that Lucifer would have acted as he did unless special authority

from the church on account of the indulgence accorded to the repentant Arians. But though that sect unhappily took its name from Lucifer of Cagliari, it is by no means certain that he himself went so far, or that he was ever guilty of schism, or, if he fell into it at all, that he died in it. On the contrary, there have not been wanting grave authorities who maintained that Lucifer died not only in communion with the church, but even in the odour of sanctity. His life, with the express title of Saint applied to him, is found in the Bollandist Acta Sanctorum of the 20th of May, from the pen of the learned Papebrochius. The controversy respecting his sanctity at one time grew so warm, particularly in the island of Sardinia, that, after the matter had been carefully considered by the Roman Inquisition, Pope Urban VIII. issued a decree, bearing date the 20th of June 1641, by which he formally prohibited anything further to be written either for or against the alleged sanctity of Lucifer, or that there should be any further public discussion respecting it in any way, under pain of excommunication *ipso facto*, until it should be otherwise ordained by the Holy See. The decree at the same time states explicitly that 'His Holiness does not intend thereby to declare or decide anything concerning the alleged sanctity of Lucifer, or in opposition to it, but he wishes it to remain in the state in which it is found.' For this decree, with further particulars, see the celebrated work of Benedict XIV., 'De Canonizatione,' t. i. lib. i. cap. xl.

had been delegated to him by the Roman Pontiff. Otherwise the whole East would have called out in indignation against such unwarrantable interference on the part of an individual Western bishop in her principal and presiding diocese; and Rome would have loudly condemned and repudiated his conduct. Lucifer was blamed for his precipitancy, but there is no record of his having been even accused of an undue assumption of authority. For this reason, and others already referred to, it may be concluded that, however imprudent the conduct of Lucifer, he nevertheless validly and legitimately conferred upon Paulinus not only the episcopal order, but the episcopal jurisdiction also which appertained to the see of Antioch. It might, however, be questioned whether that jurisdiction was not affected by the intervening decision at Alexandria, and the conduct of Eusebius of Vercelli. There is no reason for supposing that the legatine powers of Eusebius were less ample or less general than those possessed by Lucifer; indeed, precedence is given to the name of Eusebius in the letter from the council to the Antiochians. Now Eusebius did not approve the consecration of Paulinus, and declined to communicate with him as bishop of Antioch. But he did not go so far as to repudiate him; he suspended his judgment, leaving the matter to be decided by a competent tribunal. So that the jurisdiction of Paulinus does not appear to have been interfered with, and yet the position of Meletius did not suffer detriment in consequence.

The position of Meletius.

By his bold profession of the faith of Nicæa, and consequent banishment immediately after his election to Antioch, Meletius had anticipated the conditions of the indulgence afterwards accorded by the Church, and had *virtually* placed himself in a position to lay claim to its benefits. But, through the undue haste of Lucifer, Paulinus was consecrated before Meletius had had the opportunity of *formally* availing himself of the indulgence, since the decrees of the council of Alexandria had not been promulgated. It would, however, have been manifestly unjust to have thrust Meletius out of the bishopric on this account, although on the other hand, the recognised Catholic position of the Eustathians rendered it impossible altogether to reject the claims of their newly-made bishop Paulinus. It cannot be assumed as certain that it was the intention of Lucifer to reject Meletius. Theodoret says that, in consequence of the opposition of the Eustathians to his proposals for the union of both parties, he consecrated Paulinus *for them* (ἐχειροτόνησεν αὐτοῖς). It is by no means impossible that he determined at any rate to provide a bishop for the Eustathians, leaving the rest an open question. However this may have been, the practical effect of the course adopted afterwards by Eusebius, was to leave the whole matter in abeyance, till a favourable opportunity should arise for a solution of the difficulty, without interfering in the meanwhile with the episcopal functions either of Meletius or Paulinus. By withholding his private communion from both, he

Eccl. Hist. iii. 5.

excluded neither of them, but he suspended judgment between them. He could not formally recognise them both, but he might tolerate the temporary continuance of a false position, which could not have been avoided without the danger of incurring a very much greater evil. This conduct on the part of St. Eusebius of Vercelli, constitutes one of the most important features of the history. It has been seen how highly he was esteemed by the Pope, and how important his presence in the council of Milan was considered to be, on all sides. He appears, as before said, to have been invested with delegated authority from Rome, at least equal to that of Lucifer; and he would certainly represent, far more truly than Lucifer, not only the views of Rome and of the West, but those also of St. Athanasius and of the bishops whom, together with him, he had so recently assembled in council in Alexandria. He had arrived at Antioch direct from that said memorable council, which has always been held in veneration by the Church. He had taken a leading part in its deliberations, whilst Lucifer was absent. He was thoroughly imbued with its spirit, and the course which he pursued may be looked upon as dictated by that spirit. It may, at the same time, be regarded as an indication of the judgment which would be formed upon the subject in the West. On his return to Italy it would be the duty of Eusebius to give an account of the whole matter to the Pope, and the subsequent conduct of the Roman See shows her

approval of his behaviour under these difficult circumstances. Rome in fact adopted the policy of Eusebius; prudently abstaining from forcing on a crisis, and so leaving time for the sweetly disposing hand of Providence to work the required changes. She appears to have considered that the exigencies of the case justified, in the meanwhile, the toleration of the anomaly of two rival Catholic bishops in the one See of Antioch, and therefore to have tacitly permitted each of them to exercise the power and the jurisdiction which belonged to that exalted bishopric. It is a striking instance of the maternal solicitude of the Church, not to scare away feeble Christians from her bosom through an over-rigorous enforcement of the letter of her laws, when mercy in some particular instance pleads that their spirit will be more truly fulfilled, if she tolerates a temporary suspension of their outward observance.

The labours of St. Eusebius.

Socrat. iii. 9. Sozom. v. 13. Rufin. i. (x.) 30.

When Eusebius left Antioch he journeyed through the East, where, in the language of the ancient historians, he fulfilled the offices both of a good physician and a priest, receiving back the lapsed, strengthening the weak in faith, establishing and teaching the doctrines of the Church. He then proceeded to Illyricum, from which he passed to Italy, everywhere persevering in his unwearied labours for Christ. So highly was he esteemed that St. Jerome, in speaking of the liberation of the confessors from exile, says, 'at the return of Eusebius, Italy put off her robes of mourning.' . . .

Adv. Lucif. n. 19.

Tunc ad reditum Eusebii lugubres vestes Italia mutavit.

The return of St. Meletius.

Socrat. iii. 9. Sozom. v. 13. Rufin. i. (x.) 30.

There appears to have been a delay in the return of St. Meletius from his place of exile, for he did not reach Antioch till Eusebius, having arrived there from Alexandria, was endeavouring in vain to unite the divided Catholic parties. When Meletius came back, he presided over the assemblies of his followers in the Palæa, outside the gates.

It seemed to me desirable to explain fully the origin and the first development of the lamentable division we are considering, but it would require the space of a separate volume to relate all the details of its subsequent history. I therefore confine myself, though reluctantly, to a short mention of a few of the most prominent events connected with it, till I arrive at the proof that St. Meletius died in acknowledged communion with Rome.

The three exiles of St. Meletius.

Note x. sur S. Melèce.

Acta Sanct. Feb. 12.

St. Meletius was thrice exiled from Antioch on account of the faith. His first exile, under Constantius, has already been described. It is equally certain that the third took place under Valens. But there is a difference of opinion respecting the date of the second. Tillemont thinks that he was twice banished by Valens. Father Bollandus, on the other hand, places the period of his second exile under the reign of Julian, soon after his return from the first, and this appears to be the most probable opinion, though in such case the second

exile must have been very short in its duration, for St. Meletius was in Antioch in the year 363. It is said that he was then especially favoured by Julian's successor, the Emperor Jovian, who gave to him and to his followers the possession of a church which had been recently built at Antioch.

Council of Antioch, A.D. 363.

An event occurred at this time which threw considerable suspicion upon the orthodoxy both of St. Meletius of Antioch and of St. Eusebius of Samosata. After the accession of Jovian to the imperial throne, Acacius of Cæsarea, with others of the same party, proposed to Meletius to unite with him in a public profession of the Nicene faith. They were probably desirous to comply with the conditions of the indulgence accorded by the Council of Alexandria to those who had been contaminated with Arianism. They may have been actuated by real conviction; but they have not escaped the imputation of the more unworthy motive of fear lest they should otherwise be driven from their sees. An orator of the day spoke of some who were worshippers not of God but of the Imperial purple, and who changed sides like the waters of the Euripus[1] under the influence of the tides. A council was accordingly held at Antioch, by which a letter was addressed to Jovian and signed by the assembled bishops, the signatures of Meletius and of Eusebius of Samosata being the foremost. This epistle has been preserved in the ecclesiastical history of Sozomen, as well as in that

Lib. vi. cap. 4.

[1] The Straits of Negropont.

of Socrates. It recited the Nicene symbol, and professed the adherence of its authors to the same. But it prefixed to the symbol an interpretation of the word *consubstantial* which did not adequately express the full Catholic doctrine on that most essential point; for it stated that the word ὁμοούσιος, 'which appeared strange to many, had been safely interpreted by the fathers to signify that the Son was begotten from the substance of the Father, and that he is *of like* substance with the Father (ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ πατρί).' This term of *similar in substance* (ὁμοιούσιος) was admitted by the Semiarians and Macedonians, who rejected the blasphemous teaching that the Son of God was *different* (ἀνόμοιος) in substance from the Father, but would not consent to the Catholic dogma that He was of the *self-same* substance with the Father (ὁμοούσιος). This, no doubt, gave occasion for the statement recorded in the chronicle of St. Jerome (who appears to have been prejudiced against Meletius), that 'a synod was held at Antioch by Meletius and his party, in which, rejecting the *homousion* and *anomœon*, they maintained the intermediate *homoiousion*, the Macedonian dogma.' It can hardly be believed that such was really the intention of Meletius and Eusebius, both of whom are honoured by the Church for their noble defence of the Catholic faith, and their heroic sufferings in its behalf. Nor does the document in question contain a simple and unqualified affirmation of the *homoiousion*; on the contrary, it states, in conjunction with it, that the Son

Lib. iii. cap. 25.

Ep. de Synodis, n. 41. is begotten of the substance of the Father. St. Athanasius asserts that men who teach this are not to be looked upon as enemies, when they only hesitate as to the *word* ὁμοούσιον, but to be argued with as brothers who differ merely respecting the use of a term. For that those persons who confess the Son to be uncreated, of the substance of the Father, and One with Him from all eternity, are not far from accepting the word ὁμοούσιος.

It cannot however be denied, that the declaration of the Synod was insufficient, although it might be reconcilable with Catholic doctrine. It would naturally give rise to cavil on the part of those who were adverse to Meletius, and expose both St. Eusebius and himself to the danger of being considered as doubtful in their faith, by Catholics at a distance who were imperfectly acquainted with the facts. That these great men were in reality misunderstood or misrepresented in consequence, is rendered still further evident by a document to be found amongst the works of St. Athanasius, entitled, 'A refutation by our holy father Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, of the hypocrisy of Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata and their party, concerning the homousion.' The attribution of its authorship to St. Athanasius is considered to be an error, but it is thought that it was written by some other person in the year 364, immediately after the synod at Antioch. It contains no mention of the names of Meletius and Eusebius, or of any others, excepting in the title,

Tom. ii. p. 24, ed. Patav. 1777.

but it argues against the *homoiousion* as opposed in meaning to *consubstantial.* The word was undoubtedly objectionable, because open to such an interpretation; but there is no shadow of a proof that the two holy bishops, who are so unreservedly charged with hypocrisy in the title of the aforesaid document, ever intended their language to convey two meanings, or to be understood in a sense which was not perfectly in accordance with the Catholic faith of Nicæa.

By this profession of the Nicene faith Meletius formally complied with the requirements of the Alexandrian Council, if he had not previously done so. But the above-mentioned accusations were calculated greatly to retard the action of Rome and the West in his favour.

Charge of heresy against St. Meletius and St. Eusebius of Samosata. S. Basilii Ep. cclxvi. 2. Theod. iv. 21.

In fact, it is evident from one of the epistles of St. Basil that these accusations reached the ears of the Pope. In the year 377, when St. Basil's messenger Dorotheus was in Rome, and was urging the claims of St. Meletius; Peter, the Archbishop of Alexandria, the immediate successor of St. Athanasius, was also in that city, having taken refuge there from the violence of the governor of Alexandria. In the presence of the Pope St. Damasus, and of the above-named Dorotheus, Archbishop Peter denounced Meletius and Eusebius as members of the Arian faction. Dorotheus replied in terms of so great warmth that the Archbishop complained of it to St. Basil, who, in the epistle referred to, expressed his deep regret that such should have been the case. At the same time, he strongly vindi-

cated the orthodoxy of Meletius and Eusebius, appealing in evidence of the same to the persecutions which they had endured from the Arians, and calling God and his own ears to witness, that there was no word of true doctrine which he had not heard those men most freely proclaim; and he added, that he would not have admitted their communion for an hour, if he had found them halting in the faith.

Interchange of communication between St. Meletius and Rome.

This happened on the occasion of one of the many embassies despatched by St. Basil with a view to induce the Pope to send bishops to the East, in order to restore ecclesiastical discipline and peace in those distracted regions. St. Meletius also took a leading part in these embassies, as occupier of the principal See amongst the churches in the East, and it was one of his deacons who, in the first instance, was charged with the management of the business in Rome. Messengers were also sent from Rome to St. Meletius and the Eastern bishops. On both sides they were received, and the title 'brother' was bestowed on them in the formal documents. In all these transactions there is no sign whatever of any formal interruption of communion.

Evagrius of Antioch. S. Basilii Ep. clvi.

Tillemont, Vie de S. Basil le Grand, Art. ci.

An instance in point occurs in the case of the priest Evagrius of Antioch, if the words which St. Basil addressed to him in one of his epistles have been rightly understood. Evagrius had accompanied St. Eusebius of Vercelli on his return to the West in the year 363 or 364, and had done good service in the Catholic cause. About the autumn of the year 373

he returned to the East, and brought back to St. Basil from Rome certain papers which had been sent there by the Orientals. He requested another letter in their place, since they had not given entire satisfaction to those who were most strict amongst the Westerns. Evagrius suggested also an embassy of more important persons than had hitherto been sent, to solicit a visitation from the West. He conferred with St. Basil respecting the affairs of Antioch, but on his arrival in that city he did not join the communion of Meletius. In the letter above referred to, St. Basil expressed his sorrow at having learnt this, and observed that, if he remembered aright, it was not the same course which they had talked of when together. *Καίτοι οὐ τοιαῦτα ἡμῖν ἦν τὰ ὡμιλημένα, εἴ τι ἐγὼ μέμνημαι.* From this remark it is reasonably inferred that Evagrius, before leaving St. Basil, had expressed to him his intention to communicate in Antioch with St. Meletius; and although he afterwards joined Paulinus and became his successor in the episcopate, yet it is evident that if Meletius had been formally separated from the Roman communion, the devoted Catholic Evagrius newly arrived from Rome and Italy, and entrusted with a message by the Westerns, must necessarily have been aware of the fact, and could not under such circumstances have hesitated as to which of the two communions he would join, or have held out any expectations to St. Basil that he would unite himself to Meletius.

It is also to be observed that, notwithstanding his

Ep. clvi.

disappointment, St. Basil in the same letter addresses Evagrius as 'a brother truly most religious and much desired by us (ἀληθῶς εὐλαβέστατε καὶ πολυπόθητε ἡμῖν ἄδελφε).'

S. Bas. Ep. ccxiv. 2.

In a subsequent epistle to Count Terence, St. Basil speaks of Paulinus and his followers, as belonging to those 'of the household of the faith' with whom especially he desires to be in charity.

It cannot be supposed that St. Basil would in either case have used such language, if he had not considered both of the mutually divided Catholic parties in Antioch, to have been united in visible communion with Rome and the universal church.

Paulinus makes a profession of his faith.

Adv. hæreses, lib. iii. t. ii. Hær. lxxvii. n. 20.

The orthodoxy of Paulinus was called in question, as well as that of Meletius, but he abundantly refuted the early accusations against him, by subscribing a profession of faith which, according to St. Epiphanius, was written by the hand of St. Athanasius himself, and which is appended to the before-mentioned synodical letter from the Council of Alexandria to the Antiochians.

Later accusations against Paulinus. Ep. cclxiii. 5.

Some fourteen years afterwards, A.D. 377, in one of the epistles from the Eastern to the Western bishops contained in the works of St. Basil, it is observed that the Westerns themselves could say whether there had been anything reprehensible concerning the ordination of Paulinus,[1] but that the writers of the epistle

[1] From this remark it may be perceived that the Easterns did not call in question the jurisdiction of the Roman See over that of Antioch, but left the point to its decision.

bewailed his propensity for the doctrine of Marcellus, and the fact that he admitted the followers of Marcellus indiscriminately to his communion. Now Marcellus had been declared free from all imputation of heresy, both by Pope Julius I. and the Council of Sardica; and though certain of his disciples proved to be less orthodox, it does not appear whether there was sufficient foundation for accusing Paulinus of participation in their error. In those days, however, such accusations abounded on all sides, and even the great St. Basil did not escape without suffering his share of calumny. Nor can it fail to be observed, that Rome was the central authority to which all the disputants appealed. It was the earnest desire of St. Basil, and an object of his strenuous efforts, to persuade Rome to send over a commission to regulate the affairs of the East.

Glaire, Dict. des Sciences Ecclés. Art. Marcel, Évêque d'Ancyre.

St. Athanasius and St. Meletius.

To return once more to the days of Athanasius. Shortly after that great saint had been recalled to his see by the newly elected Emperor Jovian, in a letter expressive of admiration, he undertook the journey from Alexandria to Antioch to confer with Jovian on the affairs of the church, prompted by his zeal, and, perhaps, also urged by a request from the emperor, who testified his satisfaction upon his arrival by the marks of esteem and affection with which he received him. It has already been stated that Jovian is said to have been friendly to Meletius; and it is mentioned in one of the letters of St. Basil, that Athanasius 'wholly desired to be reconciled

Ep. cclviii.

in communion' with Meletius, apparently on this occasion, but that through the fault of advisers their union was deferred to another season. 'Would that it had not been so!' adds St. Basil; but he does not state the reason of the postponement. In another of his epistles he mentions a certain bishop, called Athanasius, whom the Meletians dismissed without their communion. It has been thought that the bishop thus alluded to was the same St. Athanasius the Great; and Cardinal Orsi concludes that St. Athanasius must have required conditions to which the Meletians would not accede. Tillemont, however, thinks that it must have been another Athanasius who was dismissed without communion by the Meletians. He says that the idea of Meletius having rejected the communion of St. Athanasius of Alexandria, 'is so strangely opposed both to the piety and to all the interests of St. Meletius, that' the occurrence spoken of by St. Basil, 'may be better understood of an Athanasius who had been engaged in the error, and the party of the Macedonians.' This explanation, however, does not satisfactorily agree with the tenor of St. Basil's epistle last referred to.

Epist. lxxxix. n. 2.

Istoria Eccles. lib. 17, ix.

Hist. Ecclés. St.-Melèce, art. ix.

In any case the person spoken of in his previously mentioned letter is plainly St. Athanasius the Great, and the willingness of one so highly esteemed at Rome to communicate with St. Meletius, forms an important feature in the history of this transaction.

Different degrees of interruption

Perhaps it should have been previously remarked that there were different degrees of excommunication

in the early church. In the case of individuals there was the *excommunicatio mortalis*, now called *major*, which involved entire separation from the church; and there was the *excommunicatio medicinalis*, now called *minor*, which was simply a suspension of the use of the sacraments, and sometimes also of public participation in the prayers of the faithful, in which case the penitent took his place with the catechumens. This did not involve separation from the church; and of this nature was the interruption of communion which sometimes arose between one bishop and another, or one local church and another. It was a mutual division, which did not involve any ecclesiastical censure, provided there was no ecclesiastical superiority on either side.[1]

of Ecclesiastical communion. Devoti Instit. Canon. Lib. iv. Tit. xviii. §§ 4, 5, 6, 7. T. iv. pp. 180–183. Ed. Romana 7ma 1829.

The division between St. Athanasius and Meletius, and that between St. Basil and Paulinus, appertained

[1] I state this on the authority of the Instit. Canon. of Devoti, a work published and approved in Rome. He says (*ubi supra*, § 5): 'Erat enim medicinalis, aut minoris excommunicationis loco illa unius Episcopi, aut Ecclesiæ, ab alio Episcopo, Ecclesiaque separatio, per quam fiebat, ut duo Episcopi inter se neque darent, neque acciperent literas formatas, neque alter alterius ab se separatæ Ecclesiæ filios ad communionem admitteret. Hujusmodi excommunicatio locum habebat, si aliqua Ecclesia, aut Episcopus aliam Ecclesiam in fidem, aut in disciplinam peccare intelligeret. Sed mutua hæc excommunicatio, si Ecclesiæ sibi invicem subjectæ non essent, proprie ecclesiastica censura non erat, sed tantum erat divisio, et separatio communionis, quam una Ecclesia alteri, cui non subesset, denegare poterat.' He refers, as an instance, to St. Epiphanius (Epist. ad Joan. Episc. Hierosol.), who rejected the communion of John, Bishop of Jerusalem, because he understood that he defended the errors of Origen.

only to the lesser of the above-named degrees. In the case of a church which had jurisdiction over another, as Rome over Antioch and universally, it would naturally rest with the superior church to extend the excommunication or to limit it at discretion. If Rome in any degree withheld her communion from Meletius at the period in question, of which I have found no sufficient evidence, it could only have been in the lesser degree, not to the extent of complete separation from the body of the faithful. It is needless to observe, that such a case is very different in its nature from that of the consummated and complete separation which exists between Rome and the established Church of England.

St. Basil held strongly to St. Meletius.

The letter which mentions the desire of St. Athanasius to be reconciled with Meletius, was written by St. Basil to St. Epiphanius, and it contains remarks which assist to the better understanding of the position of the two divided Catholic parties in Antioch and their upholders. I therefore subjoin the whole paragraph, with the exception of the last sentence, which has reference to the *Hypostases*: —

St. Bas. Ep. cclviii. 3. 'But, as regards the church at Antioch, that I say which agrees in the same doctrine, may the Lord grant that we may sometime see it united. For it stands in especial danger from the snares of the enemy, who bears ill-will to it because there first was established the title of Christian. And indeed heresy is divided against orthodoxy, and orthodoxy also is divided against itself. But for us the most reverend Meletius is bishop, since he first boldly defended the truth and fought that good fight in the times

of Constantius, and my church has always held to his communion, having loved him above measure, on account of that strong and unconquered firmness. By the grace of God we hold his communion till now, and, if God will, we will continue to hold it. For also the most blessed Pope Athanasius, when he came from Alexandria, altogether wished to be reconciled in communion with him, but through the wickedness of counsellors their union was put off to another season, which I wish had not been the case. But we have never yet held communion with any of those who came after, not because we accounted them unworthy, but because we had no reason for condemning the other. We have heard indeed many things from the brethren, but we do not give credit to them because the accused do not stand before the accusers, as it is written: *Our law does not judge any man, unless it first hears him and knows what he doth.* Wherefore we cannot send letters to them' (meaning to Paulinus and his followers), 'most honourable brother, nor ought we to be compelled thereto. But it would be fitting to your peaceful proposal, not to unite with one and divide with the other, but to bring those who are divided to their former union. Wherefore, first beseech, and then so far as you are able exhort, that casting away ambition from their souls, they may be reconciled with one another, in order both to restore strength to the church, and to repress the fury of her enemies.'

St. John vii. 51.

There was no interruption of communion between the friends of each party.

If Meletius had been out of communion with Rome, it is impossible that St. Basil should have so warmly espoused and held to his communion without sharing in the same excommunication. St. Epiphanius held to the communion of Paulinus, and it would seem from the above letter that he had endeavoured to persuade St. Basil to join it. St. Basil

decidedly declines, but not in such a manner as to imply that he regarded Paulinus and his followers as out of the church. Nor did the fact of their holding respectively to the two opposite Catholic communions in Antioch, occasion any rupture between St. Basil and St. Epiphanius. Indeed, the whole of the passage which has been quoted shows plainly, that the dissension was regarded as merely local and internal. Can it be conceived that two eminent Roman Catholic Bishops, such as St. Basil and St Epiphanius, would in like manner differ in their views, and exchange friendly communication respecting their difference, as regards the relative position of the Roman and Anglican communions in this country? Such an occurrence would be impossible; but such difference and such communication actually occurred in the case of Antioch, because neither Meletius nor Paulinus was formally severed from Rome and the universal church, as is the case with the Anglican communion.

The object of St. Basil.

St. Basil considered that the first step towards healing the disorders of the East was to strive for the restoration of concord to the divided church of Antioch, so that, to use his own words, that church, like a head which had been strengthened, might supply health to the whole body. He desired to accomplish this end by the union of all parties under Meletius. This was his object from the very first, and, in the year 372, he had written to urge St. Athanasius to assist him in his application to pro-

Ep. lxvi. 2.

cure the interference of Rome for the purpose. He said at that time that Meletius in reality presided over, so to speak, the whole body of the church in Antioch; that the others were, as it were, segments of parts, and that they ought to be joined to Meletius like small rivers to great, being treated in a becoming manner, and the people being pacified. He added that St. Athanasius was aware such a course 'was pleasing to his friends of one soul (ὁμοψύχοις) in the West, as the letters brought by the blessed Sylvanus to the Easterns made manifest.' We possess no further information respecting these letters; but whatever may have been the disposition of Rome (which in the present instance is synonymous with the West) at the period referred to by St. Basil, it is plain that she would not subsequently consent to the exclusion of the claims of Paulinus, though I cannot find sufficient ground for believing that she ever regarded Meletius and his followers as out of her communion. The commonly received opinion that at one time she did so, may in great measure have arisen from a circumstance which will be found, upon examination, to give no sufficient warrant for such a conclusion.

Ep. lxvii.

Paulinus receives letters from the West. S. Bas. Ep. ccxiv.

The circumstance to which I allude drew forth from St. Basil a letter to Count Terence, to which is assigned the date A.D. 375; and it is from this letter chiefly that the circumstances have become known. St. Basil states therein that a rumour has reached him that the followers of Paulinus were carrying about

letters which they had received from the West, and which attributed the episcopate of the church of Antioch to Paulinus, setting aside 'Meletius, the most admirable bishop of the true church of God.' He says he is not surprised at this, since the Westerns were misinformed as to the real position of affairs in the East. He then refers to a letter written to Paulinus by St. Athanasius the Great, which, as he appears to think, influenced the conduct of the Western bishops, and he says it is not unlikely that the persons from whom they derived their information 'either were ignorant of the true state of the case, or even concealed the reason through which the most blessed Bishop Athanasius came to write to Paulinus.' St. Basil does not mention that reason, but St. Epiphanius informs us that the profession of faith already mentioned, which Paulinus had produced to him in reply to the charge of Sabellianism, and which he has recorded verbatim, had been previously made by Paulinus to St. Athanasius as his justification, ἀπολογίας χάριν; and Tillemont concludes that this may have been the occasion on which St. Athanasius wrote the letter referred to by St. Basil, and which he seems to imply had been unduly used by certain parties, as an argument with the Westerns in behalf of Paulinus.

St. Athanasius addressed a letter to Paulinus.

See above, p. 308.

Adv. hær. lxxvii. nn. 20, 21.

St. Athanase, art. 103.

St. Basil further requests Count Terence, who was a person of influence, to inform himself respecting what had been done in Antioch by the bishops in the reign of Jovian. It may be that this remark was prompted by the imputations of heresy against Mele-

St. Basil defends the position of St. Meletius.

tius which arose out of that transaction, as has already been noticed, and from which St. Basil would be desirous that St. Meletius should be cleared; or it may be that he appealed to the said council as being a formal profession of the Nicene faith, and such as would entitle St. Meletius to the indulgence accorded in the year 362 in Alexandria, as before mentioned. He then congratulates Paulinus and his followers on having received letters from Rome, observing that he accuses no man, yea desires to maintain charity with all, especially with those of the household of faith, and expressing his hopes that the great and honourable testimony those letters bear to them is true, and confirmed by their works. But, he adds, that he cannot on that account ever be persuaded to ignore Meletius or forget the church over which he presides, or to consider the questions from which the dissension first arose as trifling and of little moment to religion. For, he says, if any one not sound in the faith should be puffed up by an epistle not only from men but from heaven, he could not on that account consider him as a partaker of the communion of the Saints, unless he professed sound doctrine. These remarks perhaps allude to the question of the *Hypostases*, of which St. Basil proceeds to treat in the same letter, and which, under the circumstances of the times, he appears both here and elsewhere to have regarded as of greater importance than it had been considered by the fathers in Alexandria, A.D. 362. It will have been observed that in a

See above, p. 304, &c.

See above, pp. 288, 289.

previous sentence, St. Basil had spoken of Paulinus and his followers as of the household of faith. Consequently the language which he afterwards used can hardly have been intended in its literal sense, if it is meant to apply to the same persons.

This letter from St. Basil was written as soon as he had learnt the report to which it refers; and before he appears to have had an opportunity of examining the letters from the West. It would not therefore be surprising if the tenor of the said letters was exaggerated, in the rumour through which St. Basil was informed of them.

Letter of St. Basil to St. Meletius. Ep. ccxvi.

St. Basil wrote also to St. Meletius informing him that he had received letters, from which he learnt that letters had been brought to Paulinus from the West, as signs of a certain priority (ὥσπερ τινὸς ἀρχῆς συνθήματα), and that the leaders of that party were much elated and gloried in the said letters, so as to propose a form of faith, and express their readiness on its acceptance to be united with the other side. He adds that he also heard that the most excellent man Terence had been led away by them to take their part, and that he had quickly written to him restraining his haste, and informing him of their fraud. As has been seen, he considered Rome to have been misinformed respecting the facts.

See above, p. 316.

The only letter extant from St. Damasus to Paulinus. Coustant, Ep. Pontif. Roman. coll. 507 &c.

There is extant a letter of Pope St. Damasus to Paulinus in reference to the reception of Vitalis to his communion, which alludes to a former letter sent to him by means of the same Vitalis, and to a

subsequent short message or letter sent through one Petronius, a priest, expressing some uneasiness in reference to Vitalis. We know of no other communications from the West to Paulinus during the lifetime of Meletius than these, about the year 375. Dom. Coustant gives only the latest of them, so that the others seem to have been lost. The one he publishes contains an evident recognition of the communion of Paulinus, speaking of union with him as being union with Rome; but it does not exclude the communion of Meletius, unless one of the clauses in the exposition of faith which it contains, must be construed as directed against him.

Clause respecting the change of benefices.

The said clause declares that Rome holds all those who have migrated from one diocese to another, as alien to her communion, until they return to their own diocese, and that if a successor in the meantime has been appointed, the one who has migrated shall be without the sacerdotal dignity, so long as the said successor survives. It is certain that Meletius was Bishop of Sebaste before his elevation to the See of Antioch, but it is not so certain that his promotion to Antioch could be considered as a migration, since Theodoret intimates that he had resigned the See of Sebaste, and was residing privately at Berœa when elected to Antioch. The causes for his resignation may have been sufficient to excuse it; so that, even if the canon of the church had been, strictly speaking, violated, his case may still have formed a justifiable exception. It is to be observed that St. Damasus does not enter

upon these considerations. He simply re-affirms an established canon of the Church, leaving it entirely an open question as to whether it applied to Meletius or not. Moreover, the clause is so abruptly introduced, and has so little to do with the context which precedes and follows it, as to wear the appearance of an interpolation, though it cannot be proved that it is so.

Why the letters were addressed to Paulinus.

There was a manifest reason why the affair of Vitalis should have been referred by the Pope to Paulinus rather than to Meletius. Vitalis had been a disciple of Meletius, and had left him, as will be explained. It would therefore not be through Meletius that he would seek admission to the Roman communion. However, he was attempting to deceive, and he does not seem to have complied with the conditions which the Pope required from him through Paulinus.

The manner in which the letters were received indicates the uncertainty of the position.

But whilst there is no sufficient ground for regarding this communication as excluding Meletius from the Roman communion, it would appear from the triumph of the followers of Paulinus, that this was the first occasion on which Rome had thus formally recognised their position. This is an important consideration, for some thirteen years had then passed since the first consecration of Paulinus. Yet his followers were elated at the reception of these letters, as at something which was new; and St. Basil, the friend of Meletius, was disappointed. Let the analogy between Antioch and England be tested by this fact. Is there any unusual elation amongst the spiritual subjects of the Archbishop of Westminster when he

receives an official communication from Rome? Is the Anglican communion on the other hand, in any way disappointed thereat? Does it in any way lay claim to, or expect, a like recognition?

It is plain that if the communion of Paulinus had been known as the communion solely recognised by Rome, and that of Meletius had been known to have been excluded by her, the Pope's letters which have been spoken of, could not have given rise to any elation in the former, nor have caused any disappointment to the friends of the rival Catholic bishop. It must further be borne in mind, that whilst this is the first occasion on which we have evidence of any direct communication between Rome and the communion of Paulinus, we find Meletius and his friends in direct communication with Rome, interchanging epistles and embassies with the West, both before and after this event, on matters connected with the faith, and the ecclesiastical affairs of the East.

Thus, the exultation of the followers of Paulinus on the receipt of these letters, and their eagerness to interpret them as adverse to Meletius, betray the fact of their uncertainty as to their actual position. Excepting in reference to the reports connected with the said letters, which he does not appear to have seen when he wrote, St. Basil nowhere intimates that Rome had disavowed the position of Meletius; but he would not himself rest contented without the exclusive recognition of Meletius as sole bishop of Antioch, and the union of both sides under him

as such. This was the end for which, as has been said, he wrote and laboured; whilst on the other hand, Rome and the West, though they did not formally reject Meletius, held communion at the same time with Paulinus and his party.

Vitalis of Antioch.

Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. vi. 25.

Vitalis, above mentioned, had been one of the priests under Meletius, and remarkable both for his well-regulated life and for the diligence with which he fulfilled the duties of his pastoral charge. It is said that he took offence at being refused access to the bishop by his fellow presbyter, Flavian. He left Meletius, drawing many persons after him, and, attaching himself to Apollinaris, became involved with him in heresy. He was ultimately consecrated by Apollinaris as bishop of his sect in Antioch. This defection of Vitalis, and the leading position which he assumed, created another centre of division in the city, which now contained four different sections of Christians, two of which were Catholic. Euzoius and his party were notoriously Arian; but the heresy of Vitalis was not so generally known, at least not for some time. By means of a verbally orthodox profession of faith, which he privately interpreted in an heretical sense, he succeeded for a while in deceiving Pope St. Damasus, and also St. Gregory Nazianzen, but the fraud was afterwards discovered.

Adv. Hæres. 77, nn. 20, 22, 23.

St. Epiphanius speaks in high terms of the life and habits of Vitalis, with whom he conversed when he visited Antioch; and it was not until after a series of questionings, which the saint has recorded, that

Vitalis avowed to him, and maintained by argument, the heretical tenet that the Godhead occupied the place of a human mind in the person of Jesus Christ. Vitalis professed to be in communion with the Roman See. This is evident from the letters of St. Jerome to the Pope St. Damasus, in which he implores to be informed with which of the three he is to hold communion, Vitalis, Meletius, or Paulinus. He does not mention Euzoius or his party, since they notoriously belonged to the Arians.

Testimony of St. Jerome to the authority of the Roman See.

These letters afford so striking and unanswerable a testimony to the doctrine of St. Jerome respecting the necessity of communion with Rome, and respecting her office as guardian of the faith, that they deserve very special attention.

Amidst the deserts of Syria, in his penitential retirement, St. Jerome was disturbed and harassed by the surrounding dissensions, and the contention respecting the *hypostases*. Finding it hard, he says, to ascertain which is the true Church of Christ in those regions, and to discern the fountain which is sealed from the broken cisterns which have no water, he has determined 'to consult the chair of Peter, and the faith which was praised by the mouth of an apostle; now asking food for my soul from thence, whence formerly I received the clothing of Christ.' He thus urges the fact of his having been baptized in Rome as an enhancement of his claim upon the Pope for a reply; but the context proves beyond a doubt, that his motive in consulting St. Damasus was

Epist. xv. n. 1, ed. Veron. 1734.

derived from his faith in the divinely constituted office and authority of the Roman See. 'I,' he says, 'following no chief but Christ, am united in the communion of your blessedness, that is, of the chair of Peter. Upon that rock I know that the Church is built. Whosoever shall eat the lamb outside this house is profane. If anyone be not in the ark of Noe, he shall perish when the deluge prevails. . . . Here I follow your colleagues, the Egyptian confessors, and beneath those laden vessels I lie hid in a little skiff. I know not Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I am a stranger to Paulinus. Whosoever gathereth not with thee scattereth; that is, whoso is not Christ's is Antichrist's.'

Ibid. n. 2.

He then enters on the question of the *hypostases*; and, though he contends most strongly that only one ought to be professed, he submits the matter unreservedly to the judgment of the Pope. 'Decree it, I beseech you,' he says, 'if it be your pleasure, and I will not fear to confess three hypostases. If you command it, let a new post-Nicene faith be made, and let the orthodox make use of the same words as the Arians.' This language is so strong that it might have been regarded as ironical, if the sequel had not shown it to be intended in its literal sense. 'If it be your pleasure,' proceeds St. Jerome, in the same paragraph, after further argument in behalf of his opinion; 'if it be your pleasure, let there be silence respecting three hypostases, and let one be maintained. . . . But if you think it right that we ought to confess

Ibid. n. 4.

three hypostases with their interpretations, we refuse not. But believe me, there lurks poison under the honey, &c.'

He concludes :—'Wherefore I conjure your blessedness by the crucified Saviour of the world, by the consubstantial Trinity, that authority may be given me by your letters either to be silent respecting the hypostases or to confess them. . . . Also, that you will signify to me at the same time with whom I ought to communicate in Antioch.' Ibid. n. 5.

The question of the *hypostases* did not regard the subject of the faith itself, but only the mode of expressing it. Still, the form of expression affected the safe keeping of the faith, and it could only therefore be determined by the competent authority to whom the guardianship of that faith had been entrusted by God.

St. Jerome's opinion on the question was strong and decided. Yet he professed his unreserved submission of the matter to the Roman See, in language which would be exclaimed against as extreme if it came from the pen of a modern Roman Catholic. There cannot then be the shadow of a doubt, that this great and free-spoken doctor of the church looked up to the Apostolic See of Rome, as the divinely constituted guardian of the faith.

He afterwards wrote again to Damasus, earnestly beseeching him to say with which of the three he was to communicate in Antioch. He reminds him how the importunate woman in the Gospel at last deserved Epist. xvi. n. 1.

to be heard, and how the friend who knocked at the door at midnight, at last obtained the loaves he asked for; how God was overcome by the prayers of the publican, and Ninive was saved by tears; how Christ gave Paradise to the penitent thief, embraced the returning prodigal, bore the recovered sheep upon his shoulders, and turned the persecutor Paul into a preacher. 'This he does,' he says, 'that the great may look upon the small, and the rich pastor not despise the sheep that is sick.' He remarks, as in his former letter, that it was in Rome he first put on the garments of Christ; and he says, that he has sought the barbarous boundary of Syria in penance. But he complains that his incessant enemy has followed him even there, so that he suffers still greater conflicts in his solitude. 'For here,' he says, 'the Arian fury rages, supported by the protection of the world. Here the Church split into three parts is eager to draw me to itself. The ancient authority of the monks who dwell around rises up upon me. I, meanwhile, exclaim, if anyone be joined to the chair of Peter, he is mine. Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus say that they adhere to you; if only one of them asserted this, I could believe him. But now, either two of them speak falsely or all of them. Therefore I conjure your blessedness, by the cross of the Lord, by the necessary glory of our faith, the passion of Christ, that you who succeed to the apostles in honour, will succeed to them also in merit; so may you sit with the Twelve on the throne of judgment; so when old may another gird you with

Ibid. n. 2.

Peter; so with Paul may you obtain the citizenship of heaven; as by your letters you shall signify to me with whom I ought to communicate in Syria. Do not despise a soul for whom Christ died.'

There is no existing record of the reply of St. Damasus; but St. Jerome was afterwards ordained priest by Paulinus, and became his ardent friend and admirer.

The fraud of Vitalis has already been spoken of, and there was, unquestionably, no genuine foundation for his profession of communion with Rome. But it is hardly credible that a bishop so holy and great as Meletius, would have made a similar assertion in his own case if it had not been true.

Date of the above letters.

The letters above quoted must have been written by St. Jerome before the death of the heretical Emperor Valens, which occurred A.D. 378, for they refer to the protection afforded by him to 'the Arian madness.'

The death of Valens, and consequent recall of St. Meletius. Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. Valens, Art. xx.

'May Valens be burnt alive!'—Such was the customary malediction of the people on that emperor whilst he was in Antioch; and so it came to pass, according to the more generally received opinion. Having been wounded by an arrow in the battle which he lost against the Goths at Adrianople, it is said that he was carried into the house of a peasant; that the barbarians set fire to it without knowing that the Emperor was inside; and that there he perished miserably in the flames, together

with all around him save one youth, who escaped alone to tell the tale. The historian, Orosius, calls attention to the just judgment of God, who thus punished Valens through those same Goths whom he had infected with the Arian heresy.

Gratian recalls the exiled Catholic Bishops in the East. Tillemont, Emp. Gratien, Art. viii.

The emperor Gratian, who had hitherto only exercised government over the West, now succeeded Valens in that of the East, and one of his first acts was the release of the exiled Catholic Bishops. Meletius accordingly returned to Antioch, where he was received with acclamations of delight by the people.

In laudem S. Meletii. Bolland. Act. SS. xii. Feb.

'All the city,' says St. John Chrysostom, 'went forth to meet him. Some indeed drew near and seized his feet, and kissed his hands, and heard his voice; but others, hindered by the multitude, only beholding him, went back contented, as if they had received a sufficient blessing from his aspect, and possessed no less than those who had been near; and what was done in the Apostles happened also in him. For as with the Apostles, in the case of those who could not go forward and draw nearer, when their shadow was extended and touched them being afar off, they drew from it the same grace, and went away in like manner healed; so now, also, those who could not approach, perceiving, as it were, a certain spiritual glory emitted from that holy head, and reaching even to those who were furthest off, all likewise departed from him filled with all benediction from his aspect alone.'

The question of

It is usually supposed that shortly after the return

of Meletius on this occasion, a compact was entered into between himself and Paulinus, whereby it was agreed that they should both continue to govern as Bishops in Antioch; but that, when one or the other of them should depart to the Lord, the survivor should have the sole charge of the whole church of Antioch, both the divided Catholic bodies being united under his rule. It does not, however, appear by any means certain that such an agreement was actually concluded.

the compact between Meletius & Paulinus.

According to Theodoret, Meletius proposed the above arrangement to Paulinus, but did not succeed in obtaining his consent. On the other hand, it is stated by Socrates and Sozomen that an agreement was made, and confirmed by oath, for the survivor to succeed to the sole episcopate. Both of these last named writers give substantially, and almost verbally, the same account. I subjoin the words of the former:—

Eccl. Hist. iv. 3.

Soc. Eccl. Hist. v. 5. Sozom. Eccl. Hist. vii. 3.

'At the same time there was a serious contention at Antioch, in Syria, on account of Meletius. We have before said that Paulinus, the Bishop of Antioch, because of his exceeding sanctity, was not sent into exile. But Meletius, after his recall by Julian, having again been banished by Valens, was lastly recalled by Gratian; and when he arrived at Antioch he found Paulinus grown old. All his followers, therefore, immediately endeavoured that Meletius should occupy the episcopal throne together with Paulinus. But when Paulinus said that it was contrary to the canons to admit to the same chair one who had been consecrated by the Arians, the people employed force, and caused Meletius to be enthroned in one of the churches outside the city. When

this was done there arose much contention. But afterwards the people came to agreement on mutual conditions. Assembling those likely to be chosen for the episcopate, they found the number in all to be six, amongst whom was also Flavian. These they bound by oath not to aim at the episcopate when either of the two bishops should die,' (and, Sozomen adds, 'not to accept it if elected by others,') 'but to permit the survivor to occupy the throne of the one who was deceased. The oaths being thus made, the people became unanimous, and were no longer divided from one another.'

Vide supra, pp. 249, 250.

It is difficult to discern which account is most worthy of credit. The passage previously quoted from the sermon of St. Gregory Nazianzen 'on the agreement,' may be cited as evidence that some compact must have been entered into. On the other hand, the priest Flavian, who is named as having been one of those who took the oath, was actually consecrated bishop on the decease of St. Meletius, during the lifetime of Paulinus; and, since he was a person of distinguished piety, it is not easy to believe that he would have fallen into the guilt of perjury. It is also very remarkable, if such a compact really existed, that it should not in any way have been referred to by the same St. Gregory Nazianzen, in the account which he has left us of his very decided opposition to the said election of Flavian.[1]

Carmen de Vita sua, vv. 1585, &c. pp. 758, &c., tom. ii. Ed. Caillau, Par. 1842.

[1] It may be remarked, that the passage in St. Gregory's writings here referred to, and its context, contain several observations in reference to the want of concord between the East and the West, but nothing which could legitimately be construed as indicative of any positive interruption of ecclesiastical communion.

Yet we find a similar compact alluded to in one of the epistles addressed by the council of Aquileia to the emperors, A.D. 381. It is therein stated that the Western bishops had received letters from those 'who differed in the Church of Antioch;' and that, but for the disturbed state of the times, they would have sent a commission to endeavour to heal the division, but, since they were prevented, they say they have asked of the emperor that, *according to the agreement of the parties*, when one of the bishops dies, the churches may remain in the hands of the survivor, and no further ordination may be attempted. *Juxta partium pactum poposcimus, ut altero decedente penes superstitem ecclesiæ permanerent, nec aliqua superordinatio attentaretur.* This evidence might be regarded as conclusive, excepting that it is quite possible the Westerns may have been mistaken in supposing that the proposal made by Meletius had been accepted by Paulinus.

Labbé et Cossart, Concil. i. col. 839. Paris, 1715.

We are not in possession of information which will satisfactorily solve the difficulty, and it is therefore impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion respecting the fact. But it is of more importance to the question before us to observe, that we have positive and undeniable evidence, both in the above cited document, and in another letter to be referred to, that Rome was agreeable to a similar compact. This certainly would not have been the case, if either Meletius or Paulinus had been absolutely out of her communion. It is plain that the Western bishops

A similar arrangement was recommended by the Western bishops.

expressed their desire, and strongly recommended, that such an arrangement should be made. For besides the above document, there is extant a letter addressed to the Emperor Theodosius by 'St. Ambrose and other bishops of Italy,' in which they introduce their complaint of the appointment of a successor to Meletius after his decease, whilst Paulinus was still alive, as follows :—

S. Ambros. Epist. xiii. 2.

'We had written,' they say, 'not long ago that since the city of Antioch had two bishops, Paulinus and Meletius, whom we accounted to be of one accord in the faith, either peace and concord should be agreed to between the same, without detriment to ecclesiastical order; or certainly, in case of the decease of either of them whilst the other survived, no election should be made in place of the defunct during the lifetime of the other.'

'*Scripseramus dudum, ut quoniam Antiochena civitas duos haberet episcopos, Paulinum atque Meletium, quos fidei concinere putabamus, aut inter ipsos pax et concordia salvo ordine ecclesiastico conveniret: aut certe, si quis eorum, altero superstite, decessisset, nulla subrogatio in defuncti locum, superstite altero, gigneretur.*'

It is perfectly evident, that if either Paulinus or Meletius had been personally rejected by Rome, such instructions could not have been written by the Italian bishops. They certainly would not have *consented* to the succession of either survivor, without distinction between the two, much less would they

have *recommended* it, if either of these bishops had been actually out of communion with Rome.

But though this testimony might be considered conclusive, we are in possession of still more important evidence.

Proof of the visible communion of St. Meletius with the Roman See. Council of Antioch, A.D. 379.

About two years prior to the second general council, an important synod was assembled at Antioch. Its acts, which were afterwards deposited in the archives of the Roman Church, afford a more formal proof than even the above-mentioned letter, of the fact that the communion of St. Meletius was at that time fully acknowledged by the Roman See; and, as it would appear, his position as Bishop of Antioch, also.

De Vita S. Macrinæ.

St. Gregory of Nyssa states that he was present at this synod, and that it assembled nine months or a little more after the death of St. Basil the Great; consequently about the month of September, A.D. 379. The second general council at which Meletius presided at Constantinople, and during which he died, took place in the year 381.

Subscription to the epistle of the Roman synod.

In the aforesaid synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, St. Meletius and the bishops assembled under him subscribed to a synodical letter or exposition of faith (of which fragments are still extant), which had been drawn up in a Roman synod held under Pope St. Damasus during the preceding year. This document is distinct both in its date and its subject from another synodical epistle which is sometimes prefixed

to it; but which is actually the copy of one addressed to the bishops of Illyricum, by a former Roman synod held under St. Damasus, A.D. 372, and sent to Illyricum by the hands of Sabinus, a deacon of Milan. Sabinus afterwards proceeded as legate to the East with a copy of the epistle, addressed from Damasus and others assembled in Rome, 'to the Catholic bishops throughout the East.' A reply was immediately returned to Rome, expressing entire assent on the part of St. Meletius and other Eastern bishops. In the collections of councils these two documents are not unfrequently placed together, under a date considerably earlier than that of the later one, which should properly be given as belonging to the Antiochian synod of the year 379, by which it was accepted in the East. At the same time it is by no means impossible that the former epistle also, may have been formally signed in conjunction with the latter, by the bishops of the same synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, in fuller confirmation of the assent which they had previously expressed to it.[1]

S. Basil. Cæsar. epp. xc. xcii.

It will suffice for the present purpose to recite the paragraph appended by the synod of Antioch, A.D.

[1] Both of these synodical letters, that is to say, the first of them, which was brought to the East by Sabinus in the year 372, and immediately assented to by St. Meletius, St. Basil, and others; and the other, which was transmitted to the East from the Roman synod under St. Damasus, A.D. 378, and subscribed by St. Meletius and the bishops assembled under him at Antioch, in the year 379; with full explanation and particulars prefixed to each, may be found amongst the Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum of Dom. Coustant, Paris, 1721, coll. 477–500.

379, to the exposition of faith of the Roman synod, held A.D. 378; with the signatures of Meletius and the other bishops, and the notification that they were deposited in the Roman archives. The following is a literal translation:—

'Here ends this epistle or exposition of the Roman synod held under Damasus the Pope, and transmitted to the East, in which all the Eastern Church, a synod having been convened at Antioch, believing with one accordant faith, and all so consenting to the same faith above set forth, confirm this each with his subscription.'

Coustant, Rom. Pont. Epist. col. 500, n. 5.

Then follow the signatures:—

'I, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, consent to all things above written, so believing and thinking; and if any one holds opinions contrary to these doctrines, let him be anathema.'

St. Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicæa, Zeno of Tyre, Eulogius of Edessa, Bematius of Mallo, and Diodorus of Tarsus, subscribe after him to the same effect, and it is added:—

'In like manner also CXLVI other Eastern bishops subscribed, whose subscription in the original is now preserved in the archives of the Roman Church.

'Here ends the Roman and Antiochian synod.'

This proves beyond doubt that the communion of Meletius was then recognised by Rome; and it is to be observed that the signature of Meletius thus formally accepted, bears the title of Bishop of Antioch:—*Episcopus Antiochenus.*

Continuation of the schism. Tillemont, Vie de S. Flavien d'Antioche. Theod. Eccl. Hist. v. 23. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. v. 9, 15. Sozom. Eccl. Hist. vii. 11, 15, viii. 3.

The schism continued after the death of St. Meletius. In spite of the earnest remonstrance of St. Gregory Nazianzen, the Easterns consecrated Flavian in his place, though Paulinus was still alive. Theodoret says, that they replied to the objections of Paulinus, by reminding him that he had refused the proposals of Meletius. Sozomen says, it was done in spite of the oath to the contrary, and that many in consequence left Flavian, and joined the communion of Paulinus. He adds that the Pope and the Westerns were greatly indignant; that they addressed synodical letters to Paulinus, but would send none to Flavian. Rome withheld her communion from the Bishops who had taken the principal part in his consecration.

Paulinus died about the year 388, having consecrated as his successor the same Evagrius who has been mentioned in the foregoing pages. He did not long survive, and no successor was appointed in his stead. Through the intervention of St. John Chrysostom when elevated to the See of Constantinople, Rome and Egypt became reconciled to Flavian and his adherents, in the seventeenth year of his episcopate. But the Eustathians, though no longer supported by Rome and the West, still kept themselves apart, notwithstanding the earnest efforts of Flavian to win them over, and they continued to do so during the whole time of Porphyry, the successor of St. Flavian, A.D. 404. About the year 413, Porphyry was succeeded in the bishopric of Antioch by Alexander of honoured memory, who had the

happiness of uniting to his communion the greater portion of the Eustathians. After many exhortations and persuasions, he assembled his own clergy and laity, and proceeding to the Church of the Eustathians, took part with them in their psalms. Thus he drew them into unity, and according to Theodoret, from the Western gate to the principal church, the united congregations formed as it were a river of men, to the sorrow of the Jews, Arians, and Pagans, who saw the other streams thus flowing into the ocean of the Church. This was about the year 415, but Tillemont states that a few still kept apart until the year 482, when the relics of St. Eustathius were brought to Antioch, on which occasion the division was completely healed.

The schism healed.

Eccl. Hist. v. 35.

During his episcopate, St. Flavian had placed on the sacred diptychs of the church, the names of both his rival bishops, Paulinus and Evagrius.

Tillemont, who refers to S. Cyr. Alex. ch. 56.

The testimony already produced renders it abundantly evident that Meletius was in acknowledged communion with Rome before the period of the second general council. But even if this testimony were wanting; if it had been unrecorded or lost, as so much else has been lost in the gulf of the fifteen centuries which have elapsed since that period, there still remains the fact that the name of Meletius stands enrolled with honour in Rome's golden book of Saints. He could not have been commemorated in the Roman Martyrology if he had not died in the

Testimony of the Roman Martyrology to the communion of St. Meletius with the Roman See.

Roman communion. No Roman churchman would in such case have proposed the insertion of his name within her sacred canon, and no Roman Pontiff would have permitted it, at any period of the Church's history. Since the so-called Reformation, the Roman Martyrology has more than once undergone careful revision and correction, but the name of Meletius is found there to this day.

Revision of the Roman Martyrology by Gregory XIII.

When Pope Gregory XIII. had completed his celebrated reformation of the calendar, he applied himself, with the assistance of learned historians, to the correction and republication of the Roman Martyrology, as he himself states in the decree prefixed to it, which is dated January 14, 1584. It is also preceded by a treatise from Cardinal Baronius, 'respecting the Roman Martyrology,' the tenth chapter of which is entitled, 'Concerning the false martyrs of heretics, and their pseudo-martyrologies.' No one will question that to the mind of Cardinal Baronius, communion with the Church necessarily implied communion with the Roman See, and separation from the Roman See involved separation from the Church. It is this, therefore, that he intends when, in the abovementioned chapter, he appeals to the teaching of the fathers, that no one can be a martyr who is not in unity with the Church, and quotes to that effect the words of St. Cyprian :—'He cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church ; he cannot arrive at the kingdom who abandons her who is about to reign.' This was always the doctrine of the Roman Church ; and

S. Cyp. Lib. de Unitate Ecclesiæ.

if she would not acknowledge as a martyr one who died in torments for his religion outside her visible pale, she certainly would not honour as a confessor any bishop, however zealous, who did not die in her visible communion.

Now this revision of the Martyrology took place shortly after the outbreak of a schism and heresy which prominently denied the necessity of communion with the Roman See. It was conducted, under the eye of the Pope himself, by men who were pre-eminent for their historical learning, and who had free access to the records and stores of information accumulated in the Roman archives. Moreover, the case of Meletius and the schism in Antioch was well known, and could not have been overlooked, particularly in connection with the newly developed heresy. It is therefore inconceivable that the memory of Meletius should have been again put forth at that time, as requiring public veneration and honour from all faithful Catholics, unless it had been made evident and certain, from the ancient tradition of the Roman Church, or from well-established facts of history, that there was no ground whatever for supposing him to have died out of visible and acknowledged communion with the Roman See.

The Roman Martyrology again revised and amended.

The above-mentioned edition of the Roman Martyrology published by the order of Gregory XIII., was again revised by the authority of his successors, Urban VIII. and Clement X., and ultimately added to and amended by the learned Pope Benedict XIV.

The Bull of Pope Benedict XIV.

On this occasion, Benedict XIV. issued the Bull,[1] *Postquam intelleximus*, 'on the new edition of the Martyrology,' dated July 1, 1748, and addressed to King John V. of Portugal, at whose instance the work had been undertaken. It gives reasons for several additions and changes then made, and examines into certain cases of difficulty. Amongst these occurs the question respecting the admission of the renowned Clement of Alexandria to a place in the Martyrology.

Litteræ Apostolicæ de Nov. Martyrol. Ed. n. 30.

His claim, however, is rejected, on account of some doubt as to his entire freedom from error in doctrine; and the Pope refers to the case of the Emperor Constantine the Great, whose name, he says, was found in the menology of the Greeks, and who was undoubtedly venerated as a saint in the Eastern Church, but whose commemoration was never transferred to the Roman Martyrology, because certain suspicions existed that he had been inclined towards Arianism.

These instances show the scrupulous caution always exercised by the Roman Church as regards every name in her strictly guarded Martyrology. Had there been the slightest ground for suspecting Meletius to have died out of her visible communion, it is perfectly certain that the Roman Church would not have ranked him amongst those to whose intercession

[1] This document, together with the others above mentioned, will be found prefixed to the excellent edition of the Roman Martyrology published, *cum approbatione*, by Mons. Dessain, of Malines, in the year 1859, after the Roman edition of the year 1845.

in the courts of heaven she especially looks up, and whose names she year by year recites in daily course, wherever her world-wide sway extends, as examples to all her children, and as demanding from them the religious veneration and the worship due only to the Saints of God.

St. Meletius is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, on February 12, as follows:—'At Antioch the festival of St. Meletius, Bishop, who, having often suffered exile for the Catholic faith, at length, in Constantinople, passed to the Lord: whose virtues were celebrated with highest praise by St. John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nyssa.'

Antiochiæ sancti Meletii Episcopi, qui pro fide catholica sæpe exilium passus, demum Constantinopoli migravit ad Dominum: cujus virtutes sanctus Joannes Chrysostomus et Gregorius Nyssenus summis laudibus celebrârunt.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE

VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

VOL. II.

Nec apud antiquos ipsius Paschalis temporis dissonantia, nec apud modernos ipsius sacrificii Christiani inter Græcos et Latinos nota varietas, charitatem lædere, vel schisma aliquod unitatis gignere potuerit. Testes sunt præcedentis rei Patres sancti, et eorum, quos Ecclesiæ reliquerunt, approbati libri, quod alio tempore Oriens, alio Occidens, alio, in eadem Britanniæ insula, Angli, alio Scoti Christiani, scilicet antiquiores, Pascha Domini celebrabant. Tetes sumus et nos temporis nostri, qui Romanam Ecclesiam, et totam Latinam Linguam offerre Deo salutare sacrificium azymi panis videmus; cum Græca Ecclesia, et maxima Orientis pars, ac barbaræ, sed Christianæ gentes, sacrificare de fermentato dicantur. Cum hoc ita sit, nec antiqui, nec moderni, propter tam celebres et famosas usuum dissonantias a charitate mutua desciverunt; quia nihil quod fidem vel charitatem læderet, in his omnibus invenerunt.

PETRI VENERABILIS *Abbat. Cluniac. ad Bernardum Abbat. Claræ-Vallensem Epistola*, Inter Epist. S. Bernardi, ccxxix. *n.* 9.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE

VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

MAINTAINED AGAINST OPPOSITE THEORIES:

WITH AN

EXPLANATION OF CERTAIN PASSAGES IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

ERRONEOUSLY APPEALED TO IN THEIR SUPPORT.

BY

M. J. RHODES, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1870.

All rights reserved.

NIHIL OBSTAT.

Gulielmus A. Johnson.

IMPRIMATUR.

✠ HENRICUS EDUARDUS,

Archiepiscopus Westmon.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

SECTION III.—*continued.*

The Ecclesiastical Position of the Celtic Churches in Great Britain.

PAGE

Distinction between disobedience and schism 1

Position of the Established Church of England 4

The uncertain nature of the historical instances appealed to as precedents for the existing divisions of Christendom. 4

The appeal of Dr. Forbes and Dr. Pusey to the early ecclesiastical differences in Great Britain 6

The different parties concerned in the said differences . 7

On the one side were: The Celtic Churches, consisting of

The Britons 7

The Scots 8

The Picts 9

Those Saxons who were converted by the Scots . 11

On the other side were:—

The Roman missionaries, with their successors, and their Saxon converts 11

None of the Celtic Churches in Great Britain were separated from communion with Rome and the Universal Church 11

The Ecclesiastical Position of the early British Church.

Territory remaining to the Ancient Britons 12

British constancy to the faith 13

The moral condition of the British people 14

The account given of them by St. Gildas 15

PAGE

Testimony afforded by the bards to the barbarous state of the nation 18
Taliessin's poem on the 'Combat of Menao' 20
Aneurin's poem entitled 'The Gododin' 21
Christian expressions in the bardic poems 22
Hatred to the Saxons esteemed to be a virtue.—Instances . 23
Prevalent licentiousness 24
The legend of King Gwynlliw's marriage with the Lady Gwladys, and of the baptism of their first-born son, Cadoc 25
British detestation of the Saxon race 27
Why the Britons would not preach the Gospel to the Saxons 28
The state of the British Church when St. Augustine came to England 30
St. Augustine's interviews with the British Bishops . . 31
His final proposals, and his reasons for insisting on them . 32
He would not have made such proposals to any who were not Roman Catholics 33
The Britons reject his proposals 33
They were actuated by personal motives, and did not intend to reject the authority of the Roman See, or to separate from the communion of the faithful in subjection to it . 35
Marks of their respect for the Roman See 36
The statement of the case by Giraldus Cambrensis before Pope Innocent III. 37
Appeal to ancient authority in evidence that the ancient British Church was not separated from Roman Catholic Communion 38
St. Eleutherius and St. Lucius 39
St. Alban 39
Other martyrs 40
British Bishops at early councils, and otherwise recognised . 40
St. German and St. Lupus, and afterwards St. German and St. Severus, visit Britain 42
The British Easter regulated by the Pope, A.D. 455 . . 43
The Saxon invasion and its consequences 43
No point of doctrine was involved in the controversy, and Rome never insisted on uniformity 45

PAGE

British Saints of the sixth and seventh centuries.

St. Dubricius, Archbishop of Caerleon on the Usk . . 46
He was consecrated Bishop by St. German, and through him the Roman Catholic religion was perpetuated in the British church 47
He founded schools of religion and of learning . . . 47
He sent forth Bishops, Abbots, and Priests, throughout Wales 49
St. Daniel, Bishop of Bangor in Carnarvonshire . . . 49
St. Illtyd, Abbot, and his college of Llanilltyd . . . 49
St. Cadoc 'the Wise,' Abbot of Llancarvan . . . 51
His maxims and his virtues 52
The honour still rendered to him in Catholic Brittany, whilst in Wales he is almost forgotten 54
The argument deduced from this contrast 56
The legend of St. Cadoc's death 56
The legend of his bell 57
The evidence thereby afforded to the contemporaneous existence of ecclesiastical communion with Rome . . 59
St. Gildas 'the Wise' 59
His talent for making bells 60
He was a pupil of St. Illtyd 60
His connection with Ireland 61
His pilgrimage to Rome 61
He founded the monastery of Rhuys, in Brittany . . 62
St. Paul, Bishop of Léon and St. Leonorus . . . 63
St. Malo 64
Visible communion between the British and French churches 64
St. Sampson 65
His parentage and early life 65
His virtues 66
His marvellous consecration as Bishop 68
He founded the monastery of Dol, in Brittany, and is sometimes styled its Archbishop 68
His assistance at a council in Paris, A.D. 557 . . . 69
His relics brought to England by King Athelstan in the tenth century 70
St. Maglorius or Magloire, successor to St. Sampson . . 71
He founds a monastery in Sark: his mode of life . . 72

PAGE

His happy death 73

The Britons in Armorica or Brittany 73

They were spiritually ruled by bishops of their own nation, who were subject to the metropolitan see of Tours, and thus they formed a part of the church of Gaul . . 74

The efforts made for the political independence of Brittany led them to assert their ecclesiastical independence of Tours 75

Instance of their ecclesiastical intercommunion with the See of Rome 76

Pope Innocent III. decided in favour of the ancient ecclesiastical rights of Tours 77

The constant fidelity of Brittany to the Roman Church, from the time of its first reception of Christianity . . 78

Reasons for regarding this fidelity to Rome as a national tradition inherited from Great Britain 78

St. Padarn, or Paternus 79

Mediæval Latin verses in his praise 81

St. David, the Patron Saint of Wales 81

His instruction under Paulinus, founder of the Abbey of Whiteland, in Carmarthenshire 81

St. David founds the monastery of Menevia, and several others 82

His mode of life at Menevia 82

His monastic rule 83

His pilgrimage to Jerusalem and consecration as Bishop . 84

The Synod of Brevi 84

St. Dubricius retires from the Archbishopric of Caerleon and is succeeded by St. David, at whose request it is transferred to Menevia 85

The Synod of Victory 86

The rule and standard of the British church confirmed by the authority of the Roman See 86

The spiritual prosperity of the British church under St. David 87

His joyful death 88

The pilgrimages to his shrine, and religious honours paid him 89

St. David and many other *ancient* Saints are not named in the Roman Martyrology . . . foot-note at p. 90

St. Theliau, or Teilo 91

He was a disciple of St. Dubricius, and afterwards of Paulinus, and a bosom friend of St. David 91

PAGE

He made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, together with St. David and St. Padarn, where the three were consecrated bishops 91

St. Theliau was appointed Bishop of Llandaff, when St. Dubricius resigned that bishopric together with his Archbishopric of Caerleon 92

St. Theliau flies with a large company of his people into Brittany, to escape the yellow sickness . . . 93

On his return he is made Archbishop of Menevia . . 94

The *Llyfr Teilo*, or 'Book of Llandaff.' Its testimony to Roman authority 95

St. Oudoceus, the next Bishop of Llandaff . . . 96

The improbable statement of his consecration by St. Augustine, at Canterbury 97

Bishop Urban's improbable statement of the early connection of Llandaff with England 98

Evidence may be derived from the mere fact of the above statements having been made, that, at the period to which they refer, the British churches were in communion with Rome 99

St. Oudoceus visited Rome 100

Instance of his meekness 100

St. Oudoceus and the stag 101

He resigns his pastoral charge, and retires to a monastic life 102

The 'Rome of Britain' 102

Examination of an alleged bardic couplet, sometimes quoted as supposed evidence of British enmity towards Rome . . . . . foot-note at p. 103

St. Kentigern, Bishop of Glasgow 104

Having been compelled to fly from his diocese, he becomes established in Wales, where he founds a bishopric . 105

Pope St. Gregory the Great supplies certain deficiencies in his orders, not essential in their nature . . . 105

Similar deficiencies were usual in Britain . . . 106

St. Kentigern recalled to Glasgow 106

His large missionary work 107

His fidelity to the Roman Church 107

The meeting between St. Kentigern and St. Columba . 108

St. Asaph, a disciple of St. Kentigern, succeeded him in the Welsh bishopric, and rule of the Abbey . . 109

St. Asaph and St. Walburge are commemorated together in the Roman Martyrology 111

PAGE

Instances of Saxon Saints honoured in Wales . . . 111
St. Beuno 112
His monastery and church at Clynnog Fawr . . . 113
The neglect which at the present time there attends his memory 114
The Jesuit college of St. Beuno 115
The conclusion to be drawn 116
St. Beuno was alive when King Ethelfrid ordered the massacre of the monks of Bangor-ys-Coed on the battle-field 116
St. Winefride, Virgin and Martyr 117
Her eager attention to St. Beuno's discourses . . . 117
Her fervent love of Christ 118
The history of her martyrdom 118
Her asserted resuscitation by St. Beuno 119
St. Winefride's Holy Well 119
She takes the veil 120
She assists at a synod 121
Her death towards the close of the seventh century, and the subsequent veneration paid to her by the Church . 122
Ancient Latin rhythm in her honour 123
St. Winefride is the last of the eminent early British saints of Wales 123
Cadwallader, styled the last of the British Kings, was reported to have made a blessed end in Rome . . 124
There was a similar story respecting a contemporary Saxon King, Cadwalla 124
Conclusion to be drawn from the history of the early British Saints as regards the ecclesiastical position of the early British Church 125

Ecclesiastical Intercourse between Wales and Ireland.

St. Patrick's connection with Britain 128
St. Bridget, St. Canice, and St. Finian 129
St. Senan the intimate friend of St. David 130
The term *Romanus* was sometimes used to designate the inhabitants of certain parts of Gaul . foot-note at p. 130
Simultaneous decease of St. David and St. Senan . . 131
St. Maidoc or Edanus 132

PAGE
St. Finbar and St Brendan 133
Customary visits of the Irish Saints to St. David, on the occasions of their pilgrimages to Rome 133
St. Carthagh the Younger, or Mochuda 133
He founded and ruled the monastery of Rathyne, to which many came from Britain, as well as from Ireland . 133
He also founded the celebrated monastery of Lismore, where he died 134
Both Saxons and Britons alike came to end their days in the monastery at Lismore 134
Ireland formed common ground for both the Anglo-Saxon and the British Christians 135
Constant fidelity of Ireland to Rome 135
Testimony to the above fact 136
Ireland's prominent position in the universal Church . 137
Lismore and St. Cataldus afford a striking instance . . 137

Continuation of the History of the Controversy.

The efforts of St. Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury, to persuade the Britons to conform to the general usages 139
His letter to the Irish clergy 140
Notice of St. Columban, who is therein referred to . . 141
St. Columban's maintenance of the Celtic computation . 142
His letters show his faith in the primacy of the Roman see 143
He is commemorated with distinction in the Roman Martyrology 144
Notice of Bishop Dagan, also referred to by St. Lawrence . 145
St. Laserian's forbearance towards St. Fintan, in reference to the Easter question 146
Position of the said controversy in Ireland 147
Instance of ecclesiastical communion between Britons and Saxons 149
St. Wilfrid sent into France to be consecrated to the see of York 150
In his absence, St. Chad was consecrated to the same see by Bishop Wini, of the West Saxons, assisted by two British Bishops 151
Bishop Wini and Bishop Agilbert 152

PAGE

St. Theodore, having been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by the Pope, arrives in England, and, in the course of his general visitation, objects to St. Chad's consecration, and completes it in the Catholic manner. St. Bede's account of the transaction 153

St. Chad gives up the see of York to the rightful bishop, St. Wilfrid, and is afterwards made Bishop of Lichfield 154

Examination into the reasons for sending St. Wilfrid into France for his consecration; and into the nature of the defects in St. Chad's consecration 154

The speech attributed to St. Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus . 155

It is at variance with St. Wilfrid's speech at Whitby, as given by St. Bede 156

St. Bede's correction of Eddius. 158

Eadmer does not follow Eddius in this case . . . 159

Apparent reasons for St. Wilfrid being consecrated in France 160

St. Wilfrid testifies to the orthodoxy of the Angles, Britons, Scots, and Picts, in a Roman synod under Pope St. Agatho 161

Grounds on which objection might be taken to the circumstances of St. Chad's consecration 163

Eadmer's account of the manner of it 164

Probable nature of the defects supplied by St. Theodore . 165

The account given by Eddius of the transaction . . 167

Comments upon it 168

Eadmer's account of the same 170

The ceremony adopted does not appear to have been that of reconciliation from schism 172

St. Chad's case affords no sufficient ground for charging the British Bishops with schism 173

The chapter stated to be from 'the Penitential of Theodore,' which treats the Scots and Britons as schismatics . 174

Its testimony is deprived of weight by the gross doctrinal errors contained in the work called 'The Penitential of Theodore,' but doubtfully attributed to him . . 175

In any case the document only possessed local authority, and might have been grounded on a mistake . . . 177

Commemoration of St. Theodore in the Roman Martyrology 178

The enactment of the synod of Hertford respecting the observance of Easter, A.D. 673 179

PAGE

The synod of Hatfield, A.D. 680 180

Death of St. Theodore, A.D. 690 181

The epistle of St. Aldhelm to the Britons, about the same year 182

Notice of St. Aldhelm 183

His description of the frequent intercourse between England and Ireland 184

His successful efforts to reform the peasantry of his neighbourhood 185

At the request of a large Synod of English Bishops, he addresses a conciliatory letter of exhortation to the Britons of Devonshire and Cornwall 186

Remarks on the terms 'heretic' and 'schismatic,' occasionally applied to the Britons . . foot note at p. 186

The fraternal heading of St. Aldhelm's epistle . . . 187

Analysis of its contents 188

He expostulates with the Britons on the severity shown by them to the Saxon Catholics who settled amongst them, and sought to unite with them in religious and other fellowship 191

Similar conduct of the Saxons towards St. Wilfrid and his friends, as described by Eddius 193

St. Aldhelm adjures the Britons, by the ties of religious fellowship, to conform to the Roman practice . . 196

St. Aldhelm's strong appeal to the authority of the Roman See 197

Remarkable words used by him upon the subject . . 199

The result of St. Aldhelm's efforts 201

St. Bede regarded the continued obstinate perseverance of the greater part of the Britons in their usages, as a punishment for their refusal to preach to the Saxons . 202

The Britons of Wales at length conformed to the Roman usages, about the year 770 204

Popular local disturbances and discontent in consequence . 205

Remarks on the alleged visit of certain British clergy to Constantinople, respecting the Easter question, in the ninth century . . . . . foot-note at p. 206

Conclusion respecting the ecclesiastical position of the early British Church 207

PAGE

Explanation of the principal points of divergence between the Celtic and the Roman customs.

The points named by St. Augustine 209
The mode of administering baptism 210
The form of the clerical tonsure 211
The Paschal question 213
The Celtic mode of computation of the Paschal season was originally derived from Rome 214
Testimony to the above fact 215
Epistle of the Emperor Constantine concerning Easter, after the Council of Nicæa 216
Divergence in practice, even after the Nicene Council . 218
Difference between Rome and Alexandria in the mode of calculating the Easter period 219
Dr. Lanigan's account of these divergences 220
They did not cause any interruption of communion . . 221
Evidence of British conformity with the Roman Easter, A.D. 455 221
The Roman origin of the Celtic practice of keeping Easter on the 14th if it fell upon a Sunday 222
Dr. Lanigan's explanation of it, after Ussher 223
Conclusion respecting the Paschal question 224

Ecclesiastical position of the Scottish and Pictish churches.

The remarks of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes evidently apply principally to the Scottish Christians 225
Allusion to St. Aidan and St. Cuthbert 226
The Scottish mission from Iona completed the conversion of England 226
England's consequent obligation to Ireland, since Iona was an Irish institution, and the term 'Scots' at that time designated the Irish 227
The monastery of Iona was the great centre of the Celtic party in the north, and at the same time of the widely extended Celtic missions to the Saxons 228
St. Bede's account of the monks of Iona 230
His language indicates that they were not separated from Roman Catholic communion 232
The origin of the Scottish mission to the Saxons . . . 233
King Edwin, of Northumbria, marries the Christian princess Ethelberge 233

PAGE

The history of his subsequent conversion to Christianity . 234

He was baptized, together with many others, by St. Paulinus, on Easter Day, A.D. 627 237

St. Paulinus, the first Bishop of York, teaches and baptizes crowds in both provinces of Northumbria . . . 237

The spread of Christianity in the kingdom, by the Roman mission, was cut short through the invasion of Northumbria by the British King, Cadwalla, assisted by the heathen Mercian, Penda; when King Edwin was slain in battle, A.D. 633 238

Cruel barbarity of Cadwalla, although professing Christianity 238

St. Paulinus and Queen Ethelberge return into Kent . 239

St. Paulinus leaves James the Deacon in Northumbria . 240

The friendly relations of James with the Scottish mission . 240

King Edwin was succeeded in the province of Deira by his cousin Osric; and in that of Bernicia by Eanfrid, son of Edwin's predecessor, Ethelfrid 241

Both these kings were Christians, but they both miserably apostatised after arriving at their thrones, and were soon after slain by Cadwalla 242

Eanfrid was succeeded by his younger brother Oswald, who, together with himself, had been instructed in Christianity according to the customs of the Scots and baptized, whilst in exile amongst that people and the Picts 243

This was the great St. Oswald, one of our most illustrious English Saints, who in life and death was bound up with the Scottish communion 243

His victory over Cadwalla, through his faith and his prayers 244

His erection of a cross on the field, before the battle, and the miracles of healing which St. Bede states to have been afterwards wrought through it 244

St. Bede describes it as the first mark of the Christian faith set up in all Bernicia 245

The devotion of the monks of Hexham to the memory of St. Oswald 246

The Saxon St. Oswald, and his enemy, the British King Cadwalla, were both equally Celtic in their religion . 247

St. Oswald, immediately on his accession to the throne, applied to the Scotch for missionaries to instruct and baptize his people, A.D. 635 248

PAGE

The first missionary who came having been unsuccessful in his efforts, St. Aidan was consecrated bishop and sent into Northumbria from the monastery of Iona . . 249
The extraordinary jurisdiction exercised by the Abbot of Iona 249
St. Aidan's episcopal see was fixed in the island of Lindisfarne 250
Reasons for not fixing it at York 251
St. Oswald completed the new church of St. Peter at York, previously commenced by King Edwin at the suggestion of St. Paulinus 251
St. Aidan establishes a monastery at Lindisfarne . . 252
St. Bede's description of the virtues of St. Aidan . . 252
St. Oswald often acted as interpreter when St. Aidan preached 254
The zeal and the success of the Scottish missionaries . 254
St. Birinus, who came from Rome to preach in Britain, baptized King Cynegils, of the West Saxons; and King Oswald, who was about to marry the daughter of Cynegils, was his godfather 255
St. Bede's account of the event 256
It was an evident recognition of the Scottish communion . 257
St. Oswald's temporal greatness and spiritual goodness . 258
St. Bede describes him as a fitting successor in religion to King Edwin, who had been instructed and baptized by the Roman St. Paulinus 259
Instance of St. Oswald's large and ready munificence . 259
St. Aidan's consequent blessing on his right hand . . 260
The miraculous preservation of St. Oswald's hand from corruption 260
Series of witnesses down to the sixteenth century, to its continued incorruption 261
St. Oswald slain in battle against the pagan King Penda . 263
His dying prayer for souls 264
The remarkable history of his relics as narrated by St. Bede 264
The miracles described by St. Bede as wrought through his relics 266
St. Oswald's constant prayers 267
The widely-spread fame of his sanctity 267
Alcuin's praise of St. Oswald 268

PAGE
St. Oswald's commemoration in the Roman Martyrology . 269
He was popularly styled Martyr 270
St. Oswald and St. Aidan are inseparably united . . 270
St. Aidan's decease in the midst of missionary labours . 271
Ensuing miracles described by St. Bede 272
In his life-time, his ejaculatory appeal to God preserved Bamborough from conflagration 272
St. Bede's high estimation of his sanctity . . . 273
St. Bede's observations on St. Aidan's observance of Easter 273
The different observance was tolerated in St. Aidan's time 276
The veneration in which St. Aidan was held by the Roman Catholic Prelates and all men 277
His commemoration in the Roman Martyrology . . 277
St. Finan, the second Bishop of Lindisfarne . . . 278
He baptizes King Peada, of the Middle Angles . . 278
The Scottish mission in Mid-Anglia 279
It is extended into Mercia 279
St. Finan baptizes King Sigebert, of the East Saxons . 280
St. Cedd was sent to instruct the East Saxons, and was afterwards consecrated their Bishop by St. Finan . 280
Ireland's large share in the conversion of England . . 281
St. Colman, the third bishop of Lindisfarne . . . 282
The controversy respecting Easter and the other points of difference becomes more serious 283
A synod is convened in St. Hilda's Abbey, at Whitby . 284
The proceedings of the synod 285
Argument between St. Colman and St. Wilfrid . . . 286
St. Wilfrid's concluding words 287
His successful appeal to the authority of St. Peter . . 288
The Roman rule accepted 289
St. Wilfrid did not charge its opponents with schism . . 289
No reconciliation to the Church was required in the case of those who conformed 290
St. Colman acknowledged St. Peter's authority, but refusing to abandon the custom of his ancestors, he departed, with others who still adhered to the Celtic rules . 291
He afterwards founded monasteries in Ireland, and he is counted amongst the Irish Saints 292
Tuda, the next Bishop of Lindisfarne 292

PAGE
Eata, the next Abbot of Lindisfarne 293
The deference shown to St. Colman's wishes . . . 293
St. Cedd conformed to the Celtic usages 294
St. Bede's account of St. Hilda, Abbess of Whitby . . 294
Her baptism by St. Paulinus, and constancy in the faith . 295
Her exemplary virtues.—Her monastic government . . 296
Analysis of her early life 298
Her religious connection with St. Aidan and the Scots . 299
St. Bede did not think it any stain on her baptismal robe . 300
St. Wilfrid went from the monastery of Lindisfarne to Rome, to study the ecclesiastical usages there followed, with the approbation and at the persuasion of the brethren of that Scottish monastery . . . 301
Notice of the great St. Cuthbert 301
His vocation to the monastic life 302
He enters the monastery of Melrose, A.D. 651 . . . 303
He accompanies Abbot Eata to Ripon, and they leave it, with all the monks, rather than abandon the Celtic usages . 304
He afterwards conforms to the Roman customs, and is made Prior of Lindisfarne, under Abbot Eata . . 305
He retires as an anchorite to the Isle of Farne . . . 306
He is consecrated bishop by St. Theodore, in an assembly of bishops at York, on Easter Day, A.D. 684 . . 306
He dies in the Isle of Farne, A.D. 687 307
Simultaneous death of St. Herbert, of Derwentwater . . 307
St. Cuthbert's commemoration in the Roman Martyrology 308
His dying words against the Celtic peculiarities . . 309
Explanation of his language on that occasion . . . 310
St. Adamnan, Abbot of Iona, visits Northumbria on an embassy from Ireland 311
He conforms to the Roman and universal customs, and persuades many in Ireland to do the same . . . 312
He does not succeed in convincing his own monks of Iona, but he does not therefore abandon his spiritual connection with them, as he must have done if the Celtic practice had involved the guilt of schism . . . 313
He died in the year 704, leaving behind him a treatise on the right time of keeping Easter, and other works . 313
Naitan, King of the Picts, applies to St. Ceolfrid, Abbot of Jarrow, for letters of instruction respecting the time of Easter, and the form of the clerical tonsure . . 314

PAGE
Summary of St. Ceolfrid's reply 314
King Naitan's public reception of his epistle . . . 317
The Picts accept the Roman and universal practice, A.D. 710 318
The English priest, Egbert, coming from Ireland to Iona, brings that monastery to conformity, A.D. 716 . . 319
St. Bede's account of the event 320
Egbert's happy death at Iona, on Easter Day, A.D. 729 . 321
Explanation of certain expressions made use of by St. Bede 322
Indications that there was no breach of unity . . . 323
Conclusion respecting the Celtic churches in general . 324
The testimony of the Venerable Peter, Abbot of Cluny . 324

The Case of the Antipopes.

Dr. Forbes's appeal to the position of the Antipopes and their followers 325
Their position was schismatical, but many might be in ignorance of the rightful pontiff 325
There is no difficulty at the present time in discerning the true Pope, or the one universal body of the faithful who acknowledge his spiritual rule 326
The case of the Antipopes aptly illustrates the doctrine of invincible ignorance; but who are in that condition? . 326

Conclusion.

The object of the present work is to show that, amongst the divided bodies of Christendom, one only can be the true Church of Christ 327
That Church must of necessity possess certain permanent outward marks and tokens 328
The one Church cannot consist of outwardly divided bodies 328
Distinction between corporate bodies and individuals . 328
Remarks on Mr. Cobb's pamphlet, entitled, '"Separation" not "Schism"' . . . . . foot-note at p. 329
The Notes of the Church are defined in the Creeds . . 330
Visible Unity is one of those Notes, and Christ's prayer has not failed in its effect 331

THE

VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

SECTION III.—*continued.*

THE ECCLESIASTICAL POSITION OF THE CELTIC CHURCHES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Disobedience is not always schism.

It should be borne in mind throughout the whole of this historical investigation, that resistance to authority does not always involve a denial of its legitimate title to respect; and that acts of disobedience do not necessarily imply a state of schism.

In family life a son may be disobedient to his parents, and yet have no hesitation in recognising the existence of the parental authority to which his conduct is opposed. He may be wanting in natural duty to his brethren, and yet be far from any intention of severing the tie of nature which unites them.

In social life a citizen may break the laws of his country, and defy the magistrates to whom their enforcement is entrusted, without any denial of the

authority of the government under which he lives, or dissolution of those bonds of citizenship which attach him to his fatherland. Nay, in the case of a distant colony it may happen that a whole body of men may refuse to obey an enactment of the parent country, or to receive an obnoxious governor whom she may send out to them, without renouncing their allegiance to her rulers, or severing the link by which they still belong to her. It may be, further, that the government at home, from prudential motives, tolerates or winks at their disobedience, and abstains from vigorous enforcement of measures which she has at heart. In all the above instances there may be found disobedience more or less culpable in its nature, and, to a certain extent, division, without involving schism or an absolute renunciation of authority.

As with the family and the social tie, so with the ecclesiastical. The Church's history affords many instances of disobedience to the supreme Pontiff and the authorities appointed by him, without any positive breach of unity. Temporary mistakes or misconceptions have oftentimes given rise to lamentable contentions, which happily have not resulted in schism. The great St. Basil was betrayed into, perhaps, unusual warmth of language, in his ardent advocacy of the cause of St. Meletius, whose case has been discussed; yet he neither separated from, nor demurred to, the authority of the Roman See. He expressed his conviction that the West was not fully in possession of the facts, and was led astray

by misrepresentations; a circumstance which might more easily occur in those early days of imperfect communication than at present. Rome, herself, urged by motives of wisdom and moderation, may at times postpone the enforcement of measures not essential, though desirable; considering it prudent to wait for their accomplishment till men's minds are more ready to receive them, when she finds that their first impulse is to resist. In all such cases there may be disobedience and even rebellion, without any formal schism, provided there is no renunciation of the Pope's authority, and no separation from his visible communion.

To refer to extreme instances. Henry IV. of Germany, in his contest with St. Gregory the Great, and our own English monarchs, in their contests with St. Anselm and St. Thomas à Becket, were rebellious and disobedient, but not schismatics; whereas in the case of Henry VIII., and of Elizabeth, we behold open and consummated schism.

Definition of schism. See Vol. I. p. 209.

The definition which St. Thomas Aquinas gives of schism has already been referred to. He says that those persons are schismatics who refuse to be under (*subesse*) the Supreme Pontiff, and to communicate with (*communicare*) the members of the Church who are subject to him. By this word *communicare* he means more than communion in the sacraments (which it is said that Anglicans sometimes seek for, in disguise), he means also communion in doctrine, and the full acceptation of the terms on which alone

the Roman Catholic Church consents to admit anyone to a participation in her sacraments.

Position of the Church of England.

Now the refusal to '*be under*' the Roman Pontiff, and the rejection of the terms of communion required by the Church which is under him, form perhaps the most prominent and especial characteristics of the established Church of England; and unless it can be clearly shown from the records of ecclesiastical history that any communion established on these principles, and living and existing by them, was ever accounted, by competent authority, to be a portion of the Catholic Church of Christ, it is useless to appeal to instances of disobedience, or of partial division, as affording any support to a theory which maintains that a religious body so wholly severed as the Anglican now is, from Rome and from the Church which is subject to Rome, can still be inwardly one with that Church in Christ, and free from the guilt of schism.

Historical uncertainty respecting the instances appealed to in behalf of the theory of invisible unity.

The instances which are brought forward, in behalf of what may be described as the theory of invisible unity, are not selected from the well-known and uncontroverted passages of the Church's history; they all of them belong to periods and refer to circumstances over which, owing to the absence of authentic documents, there hangs a heavy cloud of obscurity. So far as it is possible to pierce the cloud, and by a careful criticism to unite the divided links of evidence which have come down to us, the result of an impartial investigation will not be such as to warrant the very

decided and unqualified assertions which are made by the advocates of the theory, in a few short sentences, respecting the separated position of the persons or the Churches appealed to in its support. Were the subject merely historical, and did it involve no other consequences than the discovery of certain facts, still the love of truth alone might have been sufficient to have deterred conscientious men from rashly venturing on assertions of such importance, on points notoriously open to question, without one word of proof or the slightest intimation of any doubt. Yet such uncertain instances are unhesitatingly produced in positive and laconic sentences, in support of a theory which regards the definition of the Church of Christ, the only ark of man's salvation, and which is put forward as a practical rule of conduct, in a matter that involves the alternative of eternal life or death.

Importance of investigation.

They cannot, therefore, be dismissed as briefly as they are put forth. They demand our careful investigation, and, as the result of such investigation, it will be found, as with the instances already discussed it has been found, either that the assertions which have been made are contradicted by the facts; or else, at the least, that there is so little certainty of their truth that they cannot be relied on as affording any ground of argument, or any precedent for the position of division; in justification of the safety of which position they are produced, by those who continue to adhere to it whilst they lament it.

Early divisions in Britain.

After referring to the case of St. Meletius, which has been already treated in my first volume, Dr. Forbes continues :—

See Vol. I. p. 70.

'Subjective unity was suspended in the quarrels between the British and Western Churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of St. Aidan or St. Cuthbert.'

The Eirenicon contains an observation to the same purport. In the table of contents, there is a reference to 'St. Aidan and the British Church,' and in the paragraph thereby indicated, it is affirmed that—

Eiren. p. vi.

Eiren. p. 61.

'Our own heathen ancestors, in our St. Augustine's time, were in great measure converted by those who were not in communion with Rome, yet God blessed the zeal of both for His glory.'

These statements are grounded on a misapprehension of the historical facts, arising out of the unfounded assertions of those earlier Protestant writers, through whose gross misrepresentations the majority of our fellow-countrymen have been so miserably misled, and prejudiced against Rome and the Catholic faith. It is perfectly true that for a time there were divergences on important points of discipline on the part of the churches alluded to in Britain, from the Church of Rome, and from the rest of Christendom. It is also true that, amongst many of the Britons, the feeling of resentment on account of the national wrongs which they had sustained, was so intense as to lead them to refuse every kind of personal communication, either civil or religious, with

anyone who was of the Saxon race, whether he happened to be a pagan or a Christian. But it cannot be shown that, either the British Church, or any other of the Celtic Churches in Britain, was severed from the one great Catholic body of Christendom by any formal ecclesiastical division; or that any one of them was cut off from visible and acknowledged communion with Rome, throughout the whole period of the controversy. The discrepancy between the Celtic and the Roman customs did not involve any point of faith or doctrine, or affect the essence of the Catholic religion. The variations from the Roman and general ecclesiastical practices were therefore tolerated, though opposed by continual and patient remonstrance, through which means uniformity was at last obtained without even a temporary breach of unity, excepting so far as it was caused by the feud between the British and Saxon nations.

Definition of terms.

In order to avoid any confusion of language, it may be well to define, from the commencement, the distinction which I understand to be intended by the terms 'British and Western Churches.'

When St. Augustine arrived in Kent, towards the close of the sixth century, on his mission from the Pope St. Gregory the Great to the Anglo-Saxons, to whom the Gospel had not yet been proclaimed, there were three Christian nations of the Celtic race, who, besides the heathen Saxons, inhabited portions of the British island. These nations were :—

The Britons.

First, the aboriginal Britons, whose territory was

now restricted to the west of the island, and who obstinately refused to preach the Gospel to the Saxons, because that people continued to occupy their ancient possessions, being descendants of those fierce heathen hordes who had violently and unjustly seized them from the ancestors of the Britons.

The Scots.

Secondly, the Scots — originally colonists from Ireland, then called Scotia—who, at the period of which we are treating, inhabited the south-western portion of the mainland of Caledonia. This country did not at that time extend below the rampart of Antoninus, which stretched across from the mouth of the Clyde to the opposite Frith of Forth. The territory of the Scots included also the adjacent islands and promontories, from the Hebrides and the Isle of Skye down to the southernmost point of Cantire. It is recorded in the chronicle of St. Prosper of Aquitaine, under the consulate of Bassus and Antiochus, which corresponds with the year 431, that Pope St. Celestine ordained Palladius, and sent him as the first bishop 'to the Scots who believed in Christ.' It has been conjectured that the Scots here mentioned were those of Caledonia; but if this be the case, it would appear that they did not afterwards fully retain their religion, or their ecclesiastical organization. There is no doubt that their ultimate and complete conversion was the result of the apostolic labours of St. Columba and his monks, not very long before the arrival of St. Augustine amongst the Saxons. St. Columba was

himself a Scot, who, having crossed over from Ireland about the year 565, founded, in the Isle of Hii, or Iona, that celebrated school of sanctity whose memory still renders it one of the hallowed spots of Christendom. It was from this great Scottish monastery, and not from the British Church, that St. Aidan and his fellow-missionaries, nearly thirty years after the death of our St. Augustine, were sent forth to preach the Gospel to the heathen Saxons of Northumbria.

The Picts.

Lastly, there were the Picts. This people inhabited the north and the east of Caledonia, from the Orkneys to the Frith of Forth. A portion of the same nation was also in possession, at one time, of the often-disputed region bounded on the north by the rampart of Antoninus, and on the south by that of Severus, which extended from the mouth of the Solway to the mouth of the Tyne. This district, and a small tract of country northwards as far as the foot of the Grampians, formed the scene of the apostolate of the British St. Ninias, at the close of the fourth century. Through his preaching, 'as is reported,' says St. Bede, these 'Southern Picts, having forsaken the error of idolatry, embraced the true faith.' St. Ninias had been consecrated bishop by the holy Pope Siricius, in the year 394, and he is described by the venerable Bede as 'a most reverend bishop, and a most holy man, of the nation of the Britons, who had been regularly instructed at Rome in the faith

Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. iii. 4.

Ibid.

and mysteries of the truth.' But whatever may have been the results of the mission of St. Ninias, the mass of the Pictish nation was involved in pagan darkness when St. Columba and his monks brought to them the light of the true faith, at the same time that they laboured amongst the Caledonian Scots. They penetrated as far north as Inverness, near which was situated the principal fortress of the Pictish monarch Bridius, whose friendship and protection they obtained.

M. de Montalembert, Moines d'Occident, t. iii. p. 180.

Dispositions of the Scots and Picts.

Both the Scots and the Picts were frequently engaged in hostilities with the Saxons; but they had never been despoiled by that people of their patrimony, and, consequently, they did not participate in that implacable hatred to the whole Saxon race, which the expatriated Britons almost cherished as a virtue. Neither the Scots nor the Picts refused to spread the Gospel amongst the Saxons, and to the former in particular is in great measure due the completion of the work of their conversion. The Scots and the Picts, however, followed the same rule as the Britons as to the form of the ecclesiastical tonsure and the period of observing Easter; and these were the two points which formed the most prominent subjects of controversy between the Celtic Christians of Britain on the one side, and the Saxons converted by the Romans on the other. But neither Britons, Scots, nor Picts were Quartodecimans.

The Saxons.

The Saxons who had been taught by St. Augustine

and his successors, maintained the Roman customs; but those who were subsequently converted by the Scots, followed for a while the Celtic usages which they had learnt from them.

British and Western Churches.

The term 'British Churches' must not therefore, in the present case, be restricted to the churches of the Britons, but must include also the Scots and the Picts, in short, the whole of the Celtic Christians in Britain, as well as the Saxon disciples of the Scots. Whereas those Saxons who were originally converted by the mission from the Pope St. Gregory the Great, though also inhabitants of Britain, are for the present purpose to be classed with the 'Western Churches' in general, from whose external ecclesiastical communion the Celtic Churches of Britain are erroneously said to have been cut off.

The Celtic Churches were in communion with Rome and the Universal Church.

It is my present object to show that there was no ecclesiastical schism between any of the Celtic Christians of Britain, and the rest of the Western Church. The divergency of the Celts, on certain points of discipline, from Rome and the Catholic Church in general, does not appear to have ever involved them in any positive interruption of communion with that Church. St. Aidan and St. Cuthbert, both in their lives and after their deaths, were recognised as Saints by the whole body of the faithful to whom they were known, and were never out of the communion of Rome and the Universal Church. In fact, I am at a loss to understand whether

Dr. Forbes brings forward St. Cuthbert as a Celt or as a Saxon, so closely was he connected with both. I must however postpone my notice of these two illustrious Saints, till I arrive at the question of the ecclesiastical position of the Scots.

The ancient Britons.

To speak first of the ancient Britons.—Though this people had been dispossessed by the pagan Saxons of the greater part of their country, they still remained the masters of a large tract of territory in the west. They were to be found established in the region of Strathclyde, which, extending from Dumbarton (then called Alcluyd), near the mouth of the Clyde, down to the mouth of the Mersey on the south, divided the north of England with the Saxon kingdom of Northumbria, by which Strathclyde was bounded on the east. In the extreme south-west they still occupied Cornubia, or Cornwall; but Cambria was their stronghold, and their principal centre of habitation. The whole of it remained in their possession, including all that is now called North and South Wales, as well as a considerable tract of country to the east, extending as far as a line drawn from Frodsham in Cheshire, downwards by Wenlock in Shropshire, and the city of Hereford, to Chepstowe at the mouth of the Wye.[1]

[1] See the very useful map of 'the British Islands in the seventh century,' appended to the third volume of 'Les Moines d'Occident, par le Comte de Montalembert.' I take this opportunity to acknowledge my obligations to that valuable and interesting

British constancy to the faith.

The British nation had received the faith of Christ at a very early period, and from the time of their King St. Lucius and the Pope St. Eleutherius, they never succumbed to the assaults of heresy till they were beguiled by the deceits, or overwhelmed by the violence, of the so-called English Reformation; nor were they, as a body, on any previous occasion cut off from the communion of the Roman and Universal Church. Had such been their lamentable condition during the sixth and seventh centuries now referred to, we should not have been in possession of the mediæval testimony, which is cited by Archbishop Ussher, to their constancy in the faith, and to their catholicity. In his work on the antiquities of the British Churches, he gives the following extract from a short history of the church of Winchester :—'From the time when Britain received the faith of Christ, that faith always remained amongst them whole and uninjured by any loss: although the land was greatly contaminated by the heretic Pelagius and the heathen Saxons. For in Wales and in Cornwall the faith always produced most brilliant fruits. Wherefore, amongst other nations whom we have found to have continued steadfast in the faith which they had received, the people of Britain was the first.' 'As regards which,' proceeds Ussher, 'is to be mentioned also that couplet in the history of the Archbishops of York, about the year 1460, "Neither the Catholic Britons

Britan. Eccles. Antiq. cap. xiv. ad fin.

work, both as regards the information I have derived from it and the authorities to which it has guided me.

nor their successors ever deserted the religion they received.

Quem susceperunt cultum non deseruerunt
Nec successores Catholici Britones." '

Such was the testimony of tradition respecting the British, and the authors of these passages would not have acknowledged as the faith of Christ any teaching which was not Roman, and would not have designated as Catholics any people who were out of visible communion with the Apostolic Roman See.

Moral condition of the Britons in the early centuries.

But, although the early British Church always professed the Roman Catholic faith, and enjoyed the Roman Catholic communion, and although, as will be shown hereafter, the sixth and seventh centuries formed the epoch of the most celebrated British Saints, yet there cannot be a question that, at the same time, the general moral condition of the British people was rude and semi-barbarous; and that, making allowance for brilliant exceptions, the ordinary habits of life of too many amongst them, were at variance with the precepts of the Christian religion. Their own holy abbot Gildas, surnamed 'the Wise,' in the writings by which he endeavoured to reform his British fellow-countrymen, has left to succeeding ages a memorial of the wickedness then abounding in the nation; and his statements are in great measure confirmed by other ancient documents, which, however, bear testimony at the same time to the presence of heroic virtue.[1]

[1] See, in particular, the '*Liber Landavensis, or Ancient Register*

It is to the iniquities of the British nation that Gildas attributes their calamities both before and after the arrival of 'those most ferocious Saxons of accursed name, hated by God and by men.' He records their vicissitudes of fortune in his history 'of the Overthrow of Britain.' At the close of it, he speaks of a temporary amendment, but he adds that it was followed by a speedy relapse; 'when,' he proceeds, 'I will not say, not a vestige, but not even a remembrance of truth and justice appeared scarcely in any, excepting in a few, and very few (*exceptis paucis, et valde paucis*), who, on account of the loss of so great a multitude which was daily rushing headlong down to hell, are reckoned as so small in number that venerable mother church, in a manner, cannot see them, her only true children, reposing in her bosom.' He begs that no one will suppose it to be his intention to carp 'at the excellent life of these persons, which is admirable before men and beloved by God, and by whose holy prayers as by certain pillars and most salutary supports our infirmity is sustained, that it may not utterly fall to ruin.'

Works of Gildas, Monumenta Historica Britannica, published by command of Her Majesty, 1848; also in Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles.

De Excid. Britan. cap. 26.

of the Cathedral Church of Llandaff,' edited for the Welsh MSS. Society by the Rev. W. J. Rees, Rector of Cascob, Prebendary of Brecknock, &c. (Llandovery, 1840); '*Lives of the Cambro-British Saints of the fifth and immediate succeeding centuries*,' edited by the same, for the same Society, Llandovery, 1853, both of them sold by Longmans and Co., London. See also, *Les Bardes bretons du vime siècle*, par le Vicomte Hersart de la Villemarqué (Paris, Didier, 1860); *Les Romans de la Table Ronde et les contes des anciens Bretons*, by the same (Paris, Didier, 1860).

Works of Gildas, ubi supra.

Besides the history, he wrote an epistle of earnest admonition to his fellow-countrymen, which commences with these words:—'Britain has kings, but they are tyrants; judges, but they are impious; often plundering and extorting from the innocent, but vindicating and protecting the guilty and the robbers.' He names several kings, whose wickedness he denounces; and after lengthy quotations from the prophecies of the Old Testament, he exclaims how willingly he would there make an end, were it not that 'he beheld, raised up against God, such and so great mountains of the wickedness of bishops or other priests or clergy, and also in our own order.' 'But,' he adds, 'I ask, as I have already said above, that pardon may be vouchsafed me by those whose life I not only praise but even prefer to all the riches of the world, and of the which, if it may be, for some time before my death I desire and thirst to be a partaker.' Having reserved these exceptions, he proceeds:—'Britain has priests, but they are foolish; very many ministers, but they are shameless; clerks, but they are crafty robbers; pastors, as they are called, but, in reality, wolves ready for the slaughter of souls; . . . seldom sacrificing, and never standing with a pure heart at the altar; not correcting the people for their sins, but in truth doing the same things themselves; spurning the precepts of Christ, and careful with all their hearts to fulfil their lusts; . . . hating truth as an enemy, and favouring falsehoods as their dearest brethren;

. . . sleepy and dull in listening to the precepts of the saints, if indeed they hear them at all, as they ought to do very often, but eager and earnest after the jokes and foolish fables of secular men, as if they opened the way of life, instead of death; hoarse like bulls, because of their fatness, and miserably prompt after unlawful objects.' He acknowledges that he might have framed his reprehension more mildly, but he says that the corruption has now reached such a height as to require 'the red-hot iron and the public remedy of fire, if indeed it can by any means be healed, whilst the one who is sick does not seek any cure at all.' Again he says that 'clergy, which not without grief of heart I confess, who are shameless, double-tongued, drunkards, covetous of filthy lucre, having faith, or, to speak more truly, unfaithfulness in an impure conscience, not approved in what is good, but foreknown ministers in what is evil, and guilty of innumerable crimes, are admitted to the sacred office.' He concludes by exhorting them to an earnest repentance, as 'being mightily drunken with the use and custom of sins.'

The faults of the clergy are more fully exposed by Gildas than by other authorities which treat of the same period, but the records contained in the 'Book of Llandaff,' and the circumstances which are related in connection with the lives of the British Saints, also bear witness to the grossness and iniquity which prevailed throughout the country, and which formed an unhappy contrast to the co-existent spirit of

Christian faith, to the presence of which these documents at the same time testify. They reveal the spectacle of a constant contemporaneous succession amongst the Britons, of men eminently renowned for sanctity, who were, in truth, the means of preserving religion amongst the people.

The poems of the British bards.

It was a period of constant warfare and disorder. The contemporary poems of the bards present a wild and ghastly picture of blood and wounds and carnage; tumultuous conflicts; ravens red with gore feasting on the dead upon the rocks; deserted banquet-halls; and weeping widows. They resound with the bard's mournful wailing over the fallen, and with his fierce praises of courage and of fiendish ardour in the fight:—

Les Bardes Bretons, p. 38.

'Forward! terrible Unour'h; bear thyself well in the battle. Better to kill than to parley!'

Ibid. p. 53.

'What efforts made Bran, the son of Mellern! He was a burning devil from hell, a wolf who was choking under his burden.'

Ibid. p. 73.

'Kendelaun, heart of a bloodhound, when thou didst descend in the mêlée, thou madest a heap of corpses.'

Ibid. p. 155.

'What thick skulls have been broken before Peil!'

Thus sang the British bards in honour of their warriors; and still further to exalt a hero's praise, they occasionally described him as 'merciless towards the enemy;' or added that 'the Frank could obtain no quarter from him.' The famous Taliessin, in his lay on the death of Owen, son of Urien,

Ibid. p 5.

Ibid. p. 107.

boasts how, after Owen had surprised a large army of the enemy asleep, 'all those who fled not at the instant were treated worse than captives.' Ibid. p. 443.

'Owen,' he sings, 'chastised them rudely—like a band of wolves which encircles the sheep.'

It should be remembered that the enemy was usually the detested Saxon, above designated as 'the Frank.'

Urien, the father of Owen, is named as a king by Nennius, who relates that 'whilst he was on an expedition, he was murdered, at the instance of Morcant' (another king), 'out of envy, because he possessed so much superiority over all the kings in military science.' History of the Britons, Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles, p. 414, § 63.

Thus do bard and historian concur in their testimony to the barbarism of the British nation of that day.

Taliessin ranked high amongst the most celebrated of their bards, and Urien was his patron. The following is one of his chants in honour of that chief, translated at full length from the French version of M. de Villemarqué, who gives it also in the original British. The word Taliessin signifies—*What a radiant brow!* and this short poem is one of the most brilliant in the whole volume. It will be seen, however, that it characteristically measures the British monarch's greatness by the lamentations which he everywhere causes. Its title and its commencement refer to a successful inroad made into the territory of the Angles, about the year 560.

THE COMBAT OF MENAO.

Les Bardes Bretons, pp. 414–421.

'This year, a chief, prodigal of wine, of gold, and of hydromel, and of courage without barbarity, crossed the frontiers;

'And followed by a swarm of lances and of his united chieftains, and his brilliant nobles, all well prepared, he departed for the combat;

'And mounted upon his horse, he has sustained the combat of Menao, kindling the bardish muse.

'What abundant booty for the army! Eight times twenty beasts of one sole colour, calves and cows!

'Milk cows and beeves, and riches of all kinds!

'Ah! I should never more have been gay if Urien had perished!

'He was cut to pieces, the chief with the foreign tongues; trembling, shuddering, the Saxon had his pale hair bathed in his blood; they carried him on a stretcher, his brow all bloody, ill defended by the blood of his people.

'That brave and insolent warrior leaves his wife a widow.

. . . . . .

'I have wine from my chief! I have wine often, thanks to him! It is he who inspires me, he who sustains me, he who guides me! No one equals him in greatness!

'But enemies are fighting together! Officer of the gate, listen!

'What a sound! Is it the earth that quakes? Is it the sea that, passing its usual bounds, mounts even to the feet of men?

. . . . . .

'If there arises a wailing in the valley, is it not Urien who strikes?

'If there arises a wailing on the mountain, is it not Urien who triumphs?

'If there arises a wailing on the hill side, is it not Urien who bruises?

'If there arises a wailing within the fortification, is not Urien the cause of it?

'Wailing on the road, wailing in the plain, wailing in all the defiles!

'There is no one who can make to cease the wailings caused by him; there is no refuge against him.

'There is no famine for those who pillage in his company.

'When he combats, clothed in his armour enamelled with dazzling blue, his azured lance is the lieutenant of death, in the carnage of his enemies.

'Ah! till I grow weak with age, and the rude anguish of death comes over me, I will never smile if I resound not the praises of Urien!'

Les Bardes Bretons, pp. 231–396.

One of the most remarkable of the bardish productions still extant, is the poem entitled 'The Gododin,' which was composed towards the close of the sixth century, by Aneurin, the brother of Gildas. Its subject is the unavailing prowess of a British army, who were utterly destroyed by their enemies, in consequence of the state of drunkenness in which they entered the field of battle, it being the period of a national feast. The poet gloats with a savage delight over the number of Saxons despatched by the British chiefs before they fell themselves. 'Certes,' he exclaims, 'they made coffins enough with their blades, coffins enough, filled with unbaptised adventurers! Better work that than the forming of alliances!'—'Rudely you made the blood flow! Laughing, as if you were drinking hydromel. Valiantly you slew men with the strokes of your swords, O terrible heroes!'

He even glories in the butchering of Saxon cap-

tives after the battle, or a part of it, was ended:—'It is a duty,' he says, 'it is a duty to sing of the illustrious chiefs who, after the end of the combat, made the river run over with blood; who gave their captives to satisfy the beak of the eagles grey;' and he names with especial honour the chieftain Kenon (one of the few who survived the battle) as 'amongst those who slaughtered them the best of all.' Elsewhere, in the same poem, the bard exclaims:—'Ah, house of Bernicia!' (Saxons of one of the two provinces of Northumbria) 'if you had had me for your judge, I would not have left alive amongst you the shadow of a man!'

In another lay, ascribed to the same celebrated bard, there occurs the following barbarous expression of hatred:—'Let the torrent of fury overflow against the Angles! It is good to kill! It is good to pile up corpses for the crows!'

Les Bardes Bretons, p. 378.

Marks of Christianity.

Yet, as their poems themselves bear witness, these bards were Christians, as well as the heroes whose deeds they recorded, and the audience who hung enchanted on their lips. The venerated author of 'The Gododin' thus sings of the drunken host:—'The army of warriors who parted for Kaltraez was noisy; the pale hydromel, their beverage, became their poison; three hundred rushed forward in combat across the lances; but after the noise there was silence: *before they could go into the churches to do penance*, the sure strokes of death had transfixed them all.'

Ibid. p. 259.

Of Karedik, 'friend of poetry,' slain in the same battle, he sings that, 'before his agony, fulfilling his duty, he defended his country. So, *when once he is perfect, the hour will arrive for his admission by the Trinity perfect in Unity.*' Ibid. p. 293.

Taliessin commences and ends his poem already mentioned, on the death of Owen, with the pious aspiration:—'Soul of Owen, son of Urien! May the Lord look upon his needs!' Les Bardes Bretons, pp. 441, 445.

But even in British ideas of sanctity hatred to the Saxon found a place. The bard Liwarc'h-Henn sings of Prince Gherent, whose memory was held in religious veneration, that he was 'the enemy of the Saxons, the friend of the Saints.' Ibid. p. 5.

So also, in the Welsh life of St. Beuno—who belonged to the seventh century—as translated by Mr. Rees, it is related that the Saint built a church in the township of his father, 'which he consecrated in the name of the Lord Christ; and he set an acorn on the side of his father's grave, which there grew to an oak of great size, height, and of a fine form, and on that tree grew a branch which reached the ground, and from the ground again upwards as high as the boughs of the tree, and there was a part of this branch in the ground, as it is at present: and if an Englishman should go between that branch and the body of the tree, he would immediately die, but should a Welshman go, he would be nothing worse.' Legend of St. Beuno. Lives of the Cambro-British Saints, p. 301.

It is also related of the same Saint that when travelling near the River Severn, having heard the Ibid. pp. 301, 302.

voice of an Englishman on the opposite bank inciting his hounds to the chase of a hare, 'he immediately returned, and, coming to his disciples, said to them, "My sons, put on your clothes and your shoes, and let us leave this place, for the nation of this man has a strange language, and is abominable; . . . they have invaded this place, and it will be theirs, and they will keep it in their possession."'

Such popular traditions, however trivial and unworthy of credit in themselves, reveal the prevalent sentiments and dispositions of the people who invented and cherished them. According to Giraldus Cambrensis, it was characteristic of the Welsh nation that, 'being naturally of a vindictive and passionate disposition, they were ever ready to avenge not only recent but ancient affronts.'

Description of Wales, b. i. ch. 17.

Appeal might also be made to the romances attributed to this age, or woven out of its legends, in order to prove the lawless and disordered state of the British nation throughout the period in question.

The poetry never wanting to the Celtic race only partially glosses over the rude barbarity of the time and country; and though the wild stories which have come down to us afford evident indications of a spirit of Christian chivalry, they also reveal the prevalence of gross licentiousness and immorality. King Arthur himself is represented as the offspring of adultery; and the romancers tell that, amongst all the fair ladies of his court, from Queen Guinevere

downwards, there was found but one to whom would exactly adapt itself the magic cloak of Tégan, which had been bestowed on King Arthur by the fairy Morgana, and invariably proved either too long or too short for every unfaithful dame.

St. Dubricius is stated to have been of illegitimate birth, though his mother was a king's daughter. Liber Landavensis, pp. 75, 76; 323.

The great St. David is described in his legend as the child of a nun, whose person was violated by a king. Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 119; 403, 404; 421.

The bard Taliessin was a foundling.

St. Cadoc, according to his legend, was the first-born son of King Gwynlliw and his wife, the lady Gwladys; who is described as 'elegant in appearance, very beautiful in form, and clothed in silken vestments.' Moved by her 'most sweet reputation,' King Gwynlliw asked her in marriage from her father Brychan, who refused; whereupon Gwynlliw armed and sent off three hundred men, who carried her away by force from Brychan's palace-door at Talgarth. There was a hot pursuit and a great slaughter, but Gwynlliw was successful, and Gwladys became his bride. The infant Cadoc was baptized by the hermit Meuthi, who, on the very night the child was born, had come heaven-sent to Gwynlliw's palace in quest of a cow, his only earthly possession, which King Gwynlliw's thieves had stolen; 'which thieves,' says the legend, 'the aforesaid Gwynlliw loved exceedingly, and ofttimes instigated to robbery.' The hermit got back his cow, and became

Marriage of Gwynlliw and Gwladys. Ibid. pp. 23, &c., 311, &c.

Baptism of St. Cadoc.

preceptor to the youthful Cadoc, as soon as he attained the age of seven; teaching him 'Donatus and Priscian,' and, above all, the knowledge and love of God.

Gwynlliw became a Saint.

Gwynlliw afterwards amended his ways, and both he and his wife Gwladys led lives of retirement and severe penance, under the direction of their son St. Cadoc. Gwynlliw's memory has since been held in religious veneration, and his life as 'Saint Gwynlliw, King and Confessor' (better known as St. Gundleius), may be read in the same volume with that of his son. It marries him, however, in a decent fashion, with the consent of the lady's father, and it says nothing of the early thieving propensities so freely attributed to him in the other legend.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 145, &c.; 449, &c.

Conduct of the Britons towards the Saxons.

It is absolutely necessary to bear in mind the rude and semi-barbarous condition of the masses of the early British Christians, in order to understand and properly estimate their conduct towards their newly converted enemies. It is not surprising, under the circumstances, that their strong sense of the wrongs which they had sustained at the hands of the Saxons, should have perverted their notions of Christian duty, tempting them to look upon revenge as justice, and to persuade themselves that the change in the religion of the descendants of their conquerors was to be esteemed as of no account, so long as they failed to make restitution to the Britons of the territory which their heathen ancestors had violently taken from them. Thus national hatred assumed the

appearance of religious schism, and differences which regarded questions of ecclesiastical discipline became widened and embittered by political animosity.

No doubt the habitual tenacity with which the British people clung to all their ancient customs would have rendered them slow to accept of reforms, even under the most favourable circumstances. But this could not of itself have given birth to that inveterate and all-absorbing detestation of the Saxons which left no room in their hearts for any sentiments of kindliness, and caused them too often to set aside even the claims and the duties of Christian brotherhood.

The cruel conduct of Cadwalla.

In the year 633, the British king Cadwalla, in alliance with the heathen Mercian, Penda, made war upon the Northumbrian Saxons; and on that occasion, it is related of him by St. Bede, that, 'though he had the name and profession of a Christian, he was so barbarous in disposition and behaviour that he neither spared the female sex nor the innocent age of children, but with savage cruelty put all to tormenting deaths, ravaging all their country for a long time, and resolving to extirpate the whole race of the Angles within the borders of Britain. Nor did he pay any regard either to the Christian religion, which had sprung up amongst them. So also,' proceeds the historian, 'even to this day it is the practice of the Britons to hold the faith and religion of the Angles as nothing, and not to communicate with them in anything, any more than with pagans.'

Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. ii. c. 20.

The Britons would not evangelize the Saxons.

Nay, they would not even consent to assist in

rescuing from paganism that portion of the Saxon nation still enveloped in its darkness, and thus open to those detested enemies the gates of a heavenly inheritance, so long as they continued to retain the earthly possessions which the Britons regarded as their own birthright.

Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. i. c. 22.

'Amongst other deeds of indescribable wickedness,' writes the same venerable Bede respecting the Britons, 'which their historian Gildas describes in tearful discourse, they added also this, that they never would by preaching commit the word of faith to the race of Saxons or Angles who dwelt in Britain together with themselves.'[1]

The motives of the Britons.

Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles, p. 275.

The motives by which the Britons were actuated in their unchristian refusal to evangelize the Saxons are very distinctly set forth in the History of Geoffrey of Monmouth, which, however unworthy of credit as to the marvels it recounts, may be regarded as of more authority in such questions as the present.

Book xi. c. 12.

It is therein related that, 'when Augustine re-

[1] Gildas himself formed an exception in this respect, according to his life in the Bollandist Act. SS. Jan. 29, which not only states (cap. ii. § 8) that he preached the Gospel to the heathen in the north of Britain, and brought back to the truth those Christians in the same parts 'who were not Catholics, but who had been enticed by diverse frauds of heretics,' but also that (§ 14) 'he instructed by his example and taught by his discourse the whole region of the Irish and of the *Angles*, as well as of foreign nations.' Ussher (Brit. Eccl. Ant. c. 14, nota ad fin.) says that Hector Boetius (Hist. Scot. ix. fol. 161, *a*) speaks of certain efforts made by King Arthur for the evangelization of the Saxons. But whatever may have been thus individually attempted was not of sufficient importance to be taken into account.

quired the subjection of the British bishops, and would have persuaded them to undertake the work of the Gospel with him among the Angles,' Dinooth, the abbot of Bangor,[1] 'answered him with several arguments, that they owed no subjection to him, neither would they preach to their enemies; since they had their own archbishop, and because the Saxon nation persisted in depriving them of their country. For this reason they esteemed them their mortal enemies, reckoned their faith and religion as nothing, and would no more communicate with the Angles than with dogs.'

The quarrel was between Britons and Saxons.

It is, therefore, undeniable that, apart from any ecclesiastical difference, there was deadly enmity between the Britons and Saxons in general. But although, on national grounds, the Britons would have little or no communication with the Saxons, yet their church was by no means cut off from visible communion with Rome and the rest of Christendom.

Evidences of British Catholicity.

It cannot be questioned that the above-quoted Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was Bishop of St. Asaph in the twelfth century, was a Roman Catholic. As such, he could not have given the description he did of the condition of the British Church at the

[1] The letter, at one time alleged to have been written by Dinooth to St. Augustine, is now generally rejected as spurious. Its forgery may have been suggested by the passage quoted in the text.

time of St. Augustine, if he had considered it to have been then outwardly separated from the communion of Rome and the universal body of the faithful. In the same chapter of his history, which has already been referred to, he states that when St. Augustine was sent by Pope St. Gregory to preach the word of God to the Angles, 'among the Britons the Christian faith still flourished, and never failed among them from the time of Pope Eleutherius, when it was first planted here. But when Augustine came, he found in their province seven bishoprics and an archbishopric, all filled with most devout prelates, and a great number of abbeys; by which the flock of Christ was still kept in good order.'

B. xi. c. 12.

St. Augustine himself, in the questions which he asked of the Pope, named the bishops of Britain in the same category with those of Gaul; from which it would appear that he regarded them as equally in communion with the Apostolic See. He asked of St. Gregory, 'How ought we to act with the bishops of Gaul and of Britain?' To which the Pope replied that it would not be right to deprive the Bishop of Arles of the authority he had received from previous Popes. 'But,' he adds, 'we commit to thy fraternity all the bishops of Britain, that the unlearned may be taught, the weak may be strengthened by persuasion, the perverse may be corrected by authority.' This answer seems to indicate that St. Gregory was not altogether unacquainted with the state of the British Christians, and if he had

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. i. c. 27.

regarded them as visibly separated from his communion, he could not have failed to allude to it on this occasion.

St. Gregory's assertion of supremacy.

It may be observed, in passing, that this assertion and exercise of supreme spiritual authority by the Pope St. Gregory affords a striking testimony to the unhesitating consciousness entertained by that great Father and Doctor of the Church that—to use the words of our Saxon saint and historian—'he held the first pontificate in the whole world, and was set over the churches already converted to the true faith' (*cum primum in toto orbe pontificatum gereret, et conversis jamdudum ad fidem veritatis esset prælatus ecclesiis*).

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. ii. c. 1.

St. Augustine and the British bishops.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. ii. c. 2.

When St. Augustine, acting on the authority thus conferred upon him by the Roman See, held his two celebrated interviews with the British bishops, at the commencement of the seventh century, he referred to certain differences on matters of discipline between the British and the Roman Church; but he made no allusion whatever to any more serious discrepancy. It was his object to obtain the co-operation of the Britons in his arduous mission to the Saxons; and the only points on which—besides such co-operation—he required them to conform to the universal practice of the Church, were of a nature materially to affect the success of their evangelical labours.

St. Augustine's final proposals. Ubi supra.

St. Bede has recorded his final propositions to them as follows:—'In many respects, indeed,' such are the words of St. Augustine, 'you act contrary to

our custom, yea, to that of the universal church; and yet, if you will comply with me in these three particulars; that you will celebrate the Pasch at its proper time; that you will perform (*compleatis*) the administration of baptism, by which we are born again to God, according to the usage of the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church; that, together with us, you will preach the word of God to the nation of the Angles: we will patiently tolerate all the other things you do, although contrary to our customs.'

Reasons for his insisting on these points.

Now, as it has been well observed by a French writer[1] upon this subject, the celebration of Easter concerns the great mystery of man's redemption, together with his hopes of a future resurrection; and the sacrament of baptism is the essential foun-

[1] Mons. Varin, at pp. 230, 231, of the second of two very important and interesting dissertations, published amongst the 'Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres de l'Institut Impérial de la France. Première série, tome v, 1re et 2de partie. Paris, 1857, 1858.' They are entitled respectively—*Études relatives à l'état politique et religieux des Iles britanniques au moment de l'invasion saxonne;* and—*Mémoire sur les causes de la dissidence entre l'Église bretonne et l'Église romaine, relativement à la célébration de la fête de Pâques.* To the latter of these papers especially, I take this opportunity to acknowledge my obligations.

Respecting the points of divergence between the Celtic and general customs, I shall speak further on. (See below, pp. 209, &c.). I will only now observe that it is remarkable we should hear no more of the difference respecting baptism, after St. Augustine's mention of it; excepting perhaps in a passage referred to below, p. 210. On the other hand, St. Augustine said nothing in reference to the form of tonsure, a question which afterwards assumed such great and undue importance.

dation and commencement of the whole Christian life. It is evident that any difference between the messengers of the new religion, even as to externals and ceremonials, upon points so important as these, would be calculated to impair the efficiency of their mission to the heathen, and to perplex the newly converted Christians. This may have been the reason why St. Augustine more especially insisted upon conformity in these respects.

He treats the British as Roman Catholics.

At the same time, it is evident that he would not have requested the co-operation of the Britons at all, if they had not been in acknowledged communion with Rome and the universal church, and had not agreed with him in the recognition of the supreme authority of the Pope. Or, at least, if such had been their position, submission to the authority of the Roman Pontiff would have been the very first act he would have required from them, as a preliminary to their reconciliation, whereas he does not even allude to the point, or to the existence of any separation excepting from the Anglo-Saxons.

They reject his proposals. Rer. Anglic. post Bedam Scriptores, ed. Savile, p. 325.

The British bishops, as is well known, rejected the proposals of St. Augustine, who, 'after the Roman fashion,' says Henry of Huntingdon, had remained seated in his chair when they came to the place of assembly on the occasion of their final interview. It was reported, says St. Bede, that a certain anchorite, whom they had consulted, had previously counselled them to observe the conduct of St. Augustine in this respect, as a test of his humility, and of the authority

Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. ii. c. 2.

of his mission; and he adds that, so soon as they saw him sitting, 'they flew into a passion, and, regarding him as proud, strove to contradict all that he said.'

Ibid.

The result was that they finally 'answered him that they would do none of these things, nor would they have him for archbishop; saying to one another that, if now he would not rise up to us, how much more will he despise us as of no account if we shall begin to be subject to him?'

The reply of St. Augustine.

In loco citat.

St. Bede has recorded the reply which St. Augustine was reported to have made to the British, and it does not even accuse them of disobedience. 'It is said that, threatening, he predicted that, if they would not accept of peace with brethren, they would have to accept of war with enemies; and if they would not preach the way of life to the nation of the Angles, they would have to suffer at their hands the vengeance of death.'

Supposed fulfilment of his prediction.

In loc. cit.

St. Bede considered that this prediction was fulfilled when, not many years after the death of St. Augustine, the heathen Saxon Ethelfrid, as he relates, commanded the massacre of a large body of the monks of Bangor, having perceived them on the battlefield engaged in prayers for the success of the British army with which he was on the point of engaging in combat.

St. Augustine would be regarded as Saxon.

Hist. Eccl. Angl. lib. ii. c. 2.

St. Augustine had employed the assistance of the Saxon monarch Ethelbert (*adjutorio usus Ædilbercti regis*, says St. Bede), in order to procure a conference with the British bishops; and although he came to

them as legate of the Pope, yet their suspicions would necessarily be aroused by his close connection and friendship with their Saxon foes, and they would look upon him, more or less, in the light of an envoy from that detested nation. It has been shown how bitterly the British people hated all the Saxons, and how the lays of the bards cherished and breathed forth that hatred. These same poems, which both formed and expressed the national sentiments, were resounding in the ears of the British, and deeply responded to in their hearts, when the Roman friend of the enemies they abhorred appeared amongst them, under the protection of those self-same enemies, requiring of them to abandon ancient customs which they cherished, and to be at peace with, and strive to win over to the faith, detested foes who had despoiled them. The embassy and the object were eminently Christian, and the rejection of the proposals of St. Augustine by the British was neither in conformity with the precepts of the Gospel of Christ, nor consistent with their duty to the Pope as the head of Christ's Church on earth. But their conduct did not constitute a schism, nor did their refusal to obey, or to be persuaded by, the Pope's legate, in this particular instance, imply any general disavowal on their part of the Pope's authority. They were uncourteous in their behaviour and refractory in their proceedings, but they neither disclaimed their spiritual subjection to the Roman Pontiff nor became separated from the great body of the faith-

The British did not reject the authority of the Roman See, and were not separated from the Roman communion.

ful who acknowledged his ecclesiastical rule.[1] St. Theodore and the Saxon dignitaries were equally disobedient to Rome, though under different circumstances, in the matter of St. Wilfrid, yet they never were accused of schism, nor can the deference of the Saxons to the Roman See be called in question.

Marks of respect for the Roman See.

Indeed, the fact of the Britons consenting to meet St. Augustine at all, when, personally, he was almost identified with the abominated Saxons, and to treat with him to the extent they did, in two formal conferences, is a manifest indication of the respect which they entertained for his position, as legate of the Pope. Moreover, they evidently took into consideration the question of accepting his authority, and applied a personal test before refusing to be subject to him; whereas they would have instantly rejected the proposal, if they had felt no deference for the Roman See.

Counteracting motives.

They respected the Pope's authority, but they could not bring themselves to submit to the intermediate exercise of it on the part of the archbishop of a Saxon See, and the intimate friend of a Saxon king; and they would not at the request of

[1] A somewhat analogous case in a Catholic country came under my notice whilst I was penning these lines. The inhabitants of a certain parish, out of personal motives, for some time refused to accept as their pastor a priest whom their bishop had legitimately appointed over them. But these men never dreamed of questioning the authority of their bishop, or of separating from those who obeyed him. No one suspected them of any such ideas.

such a one, either alter their ancient customs or relinquish their ancient enmities.

It does not appear that St. Augustine took any steps to enforce his authority over the British bishops; and his immediate successors, likewise, seem to have left the matter in abeyance.

Their rejection of St. Augustine was personal, and was winked at. De jure et statu Menevensis Ecclesiæ, apud Wharton, Anglia Sacra, t. ii. pp. 540–44.

In the reign of King John, Giraldus Cambrensis appealed to Pope Innocent III. in person, for the confirmation of his election to the ancient British Metropolitan See of Menevia, in opposition to the English interest. He maintained, on that occasion, that up to the time of King Henry I., the British, or as it was then styled, the Welsh Church, had been immediately subject to Rome, and independent of all subordinate authority. In support of this statement he appealed to the refusal of the British bishops to be subject to St. Augustine. He admitted that Pope St. Gregory had 'wished all the bishops of the whole island of Britain to be subject to St. Augustine *personally*' (*quod omnes totius Insulæ Britannicæ Episcopos Augustino voluerit personaliter esse subjectos*); but he said that St. Augustine winked at, and passed over, the insubordination of the Welsh Church on account of the tender state of the faith newly planted in the British island. *Quòd autem Augustinus Walensicam Ecclesiam sibi, ut dictum est, rebellem invenit, propter novellam et teneram fidei in Insulâ Britannicâ plantationem sub dissimulatione transivit.* He stated further that the immediate successors of St. Augustine had exercised no

authority over the British Church. Giraldus failed in his object; but the above-recited argument was favourably received by the Pope, to whom it certainly could never have been offered if it had been thought that, at the period to which it referred, the British were not in visible communion with Rome, or had become separated from that communion by their conduct towards St. Augustine, or subsequently. Giraldus also referred to the differences which anciently prevailed throughout the island, respecting the time for the observance of Easter; but he did not speak of any of the dissentients as having been outwardly separated from the church.

Appeal to ancient authority.

The antique records of the time, the ancient lives of Saints compiled from more ancient documents and traditions, as well as the few fragments still in existence of the history of those ages, may be appealed to as evidence, that, during the whole of the period in question, there was no interruption of visible ecclesiastical communion between the British Church and the See of Rome; and that the notion of any separation from that centre and source of unity never found entrance into the popular and prevalent religious belief of the Britons of that time. The British saints would not have been eulogised as they were in the writings of the middle ages, if the slightest suspicion had then been entertained that the body of Christians to which those saints belonged, was, during their lifetime, visibly separated from the

universal church, or out of communion with the Apostolic See of Rome.

We know, on the unquestionable authority of St. Bede and others, that as early as the second century Pope St. Eleutherius sent missionaries into Britain, at the request of St. Lucius, a British King. There is no sufficient proof that Christianity had been previously preached in our island, but in any case it is evident from the above-mentioned fact, that, at the time of St. Eleutherius, which was about A.D. 176–189, the British were in visible and close communion with the Roman Pontiff.

The ancient British Church. Hist. Eccl. i. 4. Nennius, Liber Landavensis, Vatican manuscript, &c., &c., &c.

It has also been supposed, though on other authority, that the same King Lucius resigned his crown, and after preaching the faith of Christ in Germany, founded the church of Coire in the Grisons, where he is especially honoured to the present day. The Roman martyrology records his festival on the third of December, as follows:—'At Coire in Germany' the feast 'of St. Lucius, king of the Britons, who first amongst those kings received the faith of Christ, at the time of Pope Eleutherius.'

Butler, Lives of the Saints, St. Lucius, Dec. 3.

'The Britons,' says St. Bede, 'preserved the faith which they had received, uncorrupted and entire, in peace and tranquillity, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian.' Then, towards the close of the third century, or at the opening of the fourth, the storm of persecution fell upon them as well as upon others, and purpled the soil of Britain with the blood of her proto-martyr, St. Alban. He is commemorated on

Hist. Eccl. i. 4.

St. Alban. Ibid. i. 6, 7.

the 22nd of June in the Roman martyrology, together with the soldier who, having been converted whilst conducting him to execution, was rewarded with the baptism of blood.

Other martyrs.

But, though the first, he was not the only British martyr during this persecution. On the first of July the Roman martyrology records the feast, — 'In Britain, of the holy martyrs Julius and Aaron, who suffered after St. Alban, in the persecution of Diocletian: at which time in the same country a very great number having been tortured with diverse torments and most cruelly lacerated, attained, after the struggle was over, to the joys of the heavenly city.' The words are nearly identical with those of St. Bede.

British Bishops at the Council of Arles. Hardouin, Act. Concil. t. i. coll. 261–267.

Not many years afterwards (A.D. 314), we find British Bishops assisting at the council of Arles, wherein the assembled prelates in their synodical letter to the Pope St. Sylvester, say, that, 'abiding in the common link of charity and in the bond of the unity of their mother the catholic church,' they 'salute him, the most glorious Pope, with deserved reverence,' and express their wish that he could have been present with them in person, had he been able to absent himself from 'those parts in which also the Apostles daily sit, and their blood without ceasing attests the glory of God.'

Testimony of the Emperor Constantine. Theod. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 10.

In 'the epistle of the Emperor Constantine to the bishops who were not present at the synod' (of Nicæa, A.D. 325,) 'concerning those things which were decreed in the council,' he expressly named

Britain in the same sentence with Rome, as amongst the Catholic churches of the world which then agreed respecting the observance of Easter.

Euseb. de Vita Constantini, lib. iii. c. 19. Vide infra, p. 217.

The subsequent variation of the Celtic churches in this respect, arose from their perseverance in the same practice which they had followed at the time of the council of Nicæa, instead of adopting the reforms which were afterwards introduced, as will be more fully explained hereafter.

The 'bishops of the British provinces' were expressly named by St. Hilary of Poictiers amongst those whom he congratulated on having remained 'undefiled and uninjured by all contagion of detestable heresy;' and to whom he wrote as to bishops of one communion in Christ, *episcopis mecum in Christo communicantibus*, rejoicing 'in the integrity of their common faith.'

St. Hilary of Poictiers, De Synodis ad princip.

From a passage in the ecclesiastical history of Sulpitius Severus it appears that British bishops were present at the council of Rimini, A.D. 359. This is a further evidence of the part which they then took in the general affairs of the church. At the same time no suspicion of heresy can rest upon the British church, in consequence of the assistance of her prelates in that assembly, for the synodical letter addressed to the Emperor Jovian by St. Athanasius and other bishops in the council of Alexandria, A.D. 363, includes the church of Britain amongst those which it names as consenting to the faith professed at Nicæa.

Council of Rimini.

Lib. ii. cap. 55, as quoted by Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 101, 102.

Council of Alexandria. A.D. 363. Hard. Act. Concil. t. i. coll. 739, 740.

St. German and St. Lupus.

In the following century (A.D. 429) the communion of the British church with Rome and with Gaul is attested through the mission of St. German of Auxerre, and St. Lupus of Troyes, who were sent by Pope St. Celestine and the Bishops of Gaul, to assist the catholic Britons in their struggle against the heresy of Pelagius. St. Bede has recorded the labours and the success of these holy servants of Christ, and how they sought the tomb of St. Alban to give God thanks '*through him*' ('sacerdotes B. Albanum martyrem, acturi Deo per ipsum gratias, petierunt'); and he adds that St. German deposited in St. Alban's tomb precious gifts from the numerous relics he had with him, and carried away a portion of the dust from the spot where the blessed martyr's blood had been shed.

Hist. Eccl. i. 17, 18.

St. German's second visit with St. Severus. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. i. 21.

Eighteen years afterwards, St. German was entreated to pay a second visit to Britain, in consequence of fears that the Pelagian heresy was threatening to break out there afresh. He accordingly returned to the island, accompanied by St. Severus, Archbishop of Treves, a disciple of his former companion, St. Lupus of Troyes. On their landing they were met by a multitude of the people, and a chief of the country. This chieftain had brought with him his son, a cripple, whom in visible distress he presented to the men of God, and whom he received back healed by their prayers, and by the touch of St. German. Moved by the miracle and by the preaching of the bishops, the people were confirmed in their adherence to the

catholic faith, and the leaven of heresy was expelled, which, as it appeared, had made but slight progress amongst them. 'Thus all things being settled,' says St. Bede, 'the blessed priests went back as prosperously as they came.'

Early accordance with the Roman Easter. Annales Cambriæ, Monum. Hist. Brit. p. 830.

It is recorded in the annals of Cambria, under the year 453, which is probably an error for 455, that the period of Easter was changed in accordance with the Pope, St. Leo; who, as is well known, gave general directions that the Alexandrian computation in place of the Roman, should be universally followed for the said year, 455. This circumstance will again be referred to.

With this chain of evidence before us, it is impossible to deny the visible ecclesiastical communion of the British church with the churches of the continent, and with the apostolic see of Rome, down to the middle of the fifth century.

Subsequent overthrow and disorder of the Britons. Hist. Eccl. i. 15.

Then came the cruel invasion of the heathen Saxons, who, as St. Bede informs us, pillaged and laid waste nearly the whole of the island. 'Structures public and private,' he says, 'strewed the ground in common, everywhere priests were slaughtered before the altar, prelates and people without any respect for dignity were in like manner destroyed by steel or by the flames, nor was there any one to bury those who so cruelly were slain.' Then, according to Geoffrey of Monmouth,—

British History, B. xi. ch. 10. Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles, London, 1848, p. 274.

'The three archbishops, viz. the archbishop of Legions, Theon of London, and Thadiocus of York,

when they beheld all the churches in their jurisdiction lying level with the ground, fled with all the clergy that remained after so great a destruction, to the coverts of the woods in Wales, carrying with them the relics of the Saints, for fear the sacred bones of so many holy men of old might be destroyed by the barbarians if they should leave them in that imminent danger, and themselves instantly suffer martyrdom. Many more went over in a great fleet into Armorican Britain; so that the whole church of the two provinces, Loegria and Northumberland, had its convents destroyed.' He says that others retired into Cornwall, from whence, as well as from Wales, the British refugees 'continually made frequent and fierce irruptions upon the enemy.'

It is not surprising that the descendants of these British christians, in their inherited affliction and indignation, should have manifested reluctance to accept instruction from the prelates of the very nation who had been the means of bringing their sorrows upon them; and that, absorbed as the whole of the people were, in this great national trouble and their own internal affairs, besides being more or less isolated in position, they should have been slow to receive and to adopt the ecclesiastical changes and reforms which had prevailed in other portions of the catholic church, on many important though not essential points of ceremonial and of discipline.

Important considerations.

There are two considerations which it is most

necessary to bear in mind in reference to the question now before us :—

First, that the matters in dispute did not involve any point of doctrine.

Secondly, that though the British practices in question were undoubtedly different from the Roman, yet the Roman See never attempted to enforce uniformity. She recommended it and urged it, and she ultimately obtained it, but she never pronounced any ecclesiastical censure on those who showed a tardiness in complying with her wishes.

The English prelates were more forward in the matter than Rome, and the Britons for a long time gave no heed to them; but this did not involve the rejection of the authority of the Pope; nor am I aware that any single instance can be produced, in which the divine authority of the Roman Pontiff was ever called in question by the ancient British church.

That authority, however, is notoriously denied by the established Church of England, for the position of which it is sought to find a precedent.

There was not even a temporary suspension of external intercourse between the British christians on the one part, and Rome and the continental churches on the other.

The line of British Saints.

The period especially under review may be defined in general terms, as commencing with the latter half of the fifth century, and terminating towards the close of the eighth. It is remarkable that, notwithstanding

all drawbacks, the earlier portion of this period, down to near the end of the seventh century, was precisely the era of the greatest British saints. Amidst the lawless disorder, barbarity, and wickedness then abounding throughout the nation, there shines forth the transcendently brilliant and continuous light of that long and illustrious succession of holiness, as if to furnish a ready answer to the imputation of schism, which has been too rashly cast upon the British church of those ages, by superficial or partial observers.

Testimony afforded by their early biographers.

In the obscurity which hangs over the British history of that time, the Lives of these saints, compiled as they have been by subsequent but still early Catholic writers, from ancient records, and from ecclesiastical, monastic, and popular traditions, bear evidence to the uninterrupted and visible communion maintained between the British church with which these holy men were identified, and the apostolic see of Rome, together with the rest of Christendom.

St. Dubricius.

Foremost in this noble company of heroic servants of the Lord, and, as it were, the father of the immediately succeeding generations of the British church, we are met by the patriarchal form of the great Archbishop, St. Dubricius. According to Geoffrey of Monmouth, it was St. Dubricius who set the crown on the head of King Arthur; and the same chronicler styles him 'Legate of the Apostolic See,' and says that he 'was so eminent for his piety, that he could cure any sick person by his prayers.'

B. ix. 1 and 12.

His consecration.

After St. German and his companion in the

mission to Britain, had frustrated the designs of the heretics, they consecrated bishops in diverse places, and are said to have also established monastic schools of learning. They consecrated Dubricius to the bishopric of Llandaff, and he was subsequently elevated to the metropolitan see of Caerleon on the Usk. This city had formed the capital of the old Roman province of Britannia Secunda, and had consequently been anciently constituted one of the three archiepiscopal sees of the island, after the introduction of Christianity. London and York were the other two archbishoprics. Caerleon thus came to be regarded, at that time, as the sole metropolitan see of the Britons who, flying from the Saxon invasion, took refuge in Wales. The churchmen of Llandaff subsequently disputed that claim, and their register represents St. Dubricius as Archbishop of their own cathedral. This idea most probably originated in the fact that when St. Dubricius was made Archbishop of Caerleon, he retained also the bishopric of Llandaff, and continued for the most part to reside there.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 66; 310. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 122–124.

Butler's Lives, St. German, July 26. St. Dubricius, Nov. 14.

Rice Rees, Essay on Welsh Saints, pp. 173, 174.

Perpetuation of the Roman Catholic religion in Britain.

The consecration of St. Dubricius by the episcopal emissaries from Rome and the church of Gaul, is a circumstance of great importance in connection with the subject we are considering. For St. Dubricius was not only one of the principal founders of those large monastic colleges which educated the future generation of the British church, but he was also their ruler, and he personally took part in the instruction

of the students who flocked to them in crowds. Many of these students became in their turn the founders, and the instructors, or the rulers of similar institutions, which might be looked upon as the seminaries of the British priesthood, as well as the centre of every kind of learning and improvement. Thus, in spite of all the vices and ignorance of the age; through St. Dubricius and his scholars; through their successors; and through those who again followed after them, so long as the sacred flame was kept alive; the spirit of St. German still animated the British church, and that spirit was the spirit of Rome and of the universal church of God. Thus, by God's great mercy, was the British church not only preserved pure in faith and doctrine amidst the evils of the age, but it was rendered prolific in saints who shine eminently amidst the brightest marvels of Divine grace.

Schools of religion and learning established by St. Dubricius. Liber Landavensis, pp. 76, 77; 324, 325.

The fame of St. Dubricius, says the Llandaff register, 'extended throughout all Britain, so that from all parts, not only scholars who were uninstructed came, but also learned men and doctors flocked to him for the sake of study, particularly St. Theliau, &c., &c., &c.' 'And with those he retained a thousand clergy for seven successive years at Henllan, on the banks of the Wye, in the literary study of divine and human wisdom; setting forth to them in himself an example of religious life, and perfect charity.'

These clergy (*clerici*) of course were not all of them priests, but, even so, the number would be amaz-

ing had we not evidence that it was far exceeded in other institutions of a similar description.

St. Dubricius afterwards removed to another place, to which he gave the name of *Mochros*, also on the banks of the Wye. On this spot 'he founded and enclosed an oratory and habitation; and there he lived by rule for many years, preaching to, and teaching the clergy and the people; whilst his learning shining throughout all Britain, as a light upon a candlestick, the whole British nation preserved the pure faith without any stain of false doctrine.' About the year 519, under the infirmities of old age, he resigned his pastoral charge and retired to the life of a hermit, in the isle of Bardsey where he died.

Ibid. pp. 77; 325, 326.

St. Dubricius sent forth his disciples to different parts of 'dextral Britain,' or Wales; consecrating some of them Bishops, appointing others as Abbots, ordaining many of them as Priests, or to the inferior orders.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 68; 313.

He consecrated St. Daniel as Bishop of Bangor on the Menai Straits, in Carnarvonshire, where the same St. Daniel founded a monastic institution in the year 516. St. Daniel died in the year 545, and was buried in the island of Bardsey.

St. Daniel.

Lib. Landav. in loc. citat. Butler's Lives, Nov. 23.

St. Dubricius likewise appointed St. Iltutus, or Illtyd, as Abbot, in the place which was subsequently called after him, Llanilltyd or Lantwit, about five miles from Cowbridge, in Glamorganshire. This institution became so celebrated, that for many generations it was regarded as the university of Britain, and was

St. Illtyd.

Lib. Land. in loc. cit. and note to p. 313.

frequented by foreigners as well as by the nobles and the people of the country. It is said that the number of its students at one time exceeded two thousand. Husbandry and other useful arts, were included in the system of education. At that period agricultural labour formed a portion of the religious life, and, besides the other great benefits conferred by St. Illtyd on the British people, he enjoys the reputation of having introduced amongst them an improved method of ploughing.

Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, p. 180.

St. Illtyd founded several churches in his lifetime, and was honoured as the patron of several after his decease. His memory was rendered illustrious both by the sanctity of his own life, and by the unusual number of distinguished saints, who revered him as their master.

Death of St. Illtyd.

The precise date of his death is uncertain, but he flourished during the last years of the fifth century and a considerable part of the sixth. In a manuscript calendar of the Benedictines, he is commemorated as 'St. Eltutus, *alias* Iltutus, Abbot, disciple of St. German, whose soul was seen to be carried off in the form of an eagle having wings of gold, and to fly away with the angels into heaven.'

Bolland. Act. SS. 24 Feb. inter SS. in alios dies rejectos.

He appears to have been an Armorican of noble birth and the great-nephew of St. German, but it does not seem probable that he was his disciple.

Welsh Saints, p. 179.

His conversion.

According to the popular legend he was originally a military officer, and was converted at the sight of the divine judgment which fell upon a band of hunts-

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 158, &c.; 465, &c.

men after they had behaved rudely to St. Cadoc, whose advice he consequently sought with a view to the amendment of his life. Having subsequently done penance, as enjoined by the Bishop, St. Dubricius, he embraced the religious state, and 'all his thoughts were in the Holy Scriptures, which he fulfilled in his daily works.' 'He lived by his own labour;' 'he fed the poor, he clothed the naked, he visited the sick and those who were in prison.' Liberal in gifts and in hospitality, 'there was no injurious elevation in his full flowing breast, but rather humility, kindness, and spotless religion.'

The wife of St. Illtyd.

His wife,—for in the days of his youth he had married,—had also abandoned the world, and founded an oratory in a mountain solitude where she dwelt. She is described as 'constant in prayer, moderate in discourse, and intent on every good work.' 'Christ was her consolation, Christ her food,' and 'the love of the Holy Trinity her inward and sole delight.'

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 172; 482.

St. Cadoc.

St. Cadoc, or Cattwg, surnamed 'the Wise' (*Cattwg Ddoeth*), was the bosom friend of St. Dubricius, by whom he was received into the clerical order. He subsequently became Abbot of the monastery of Llancarvan, situated, like Llanilltyd, in Glamorganshire. He lived during the concluding years of the fifth century, and also, as it appears, through half, if not the greater portion, of the sixth, for it is said that he attained to a very great age. He is one of the most popular of the British saints. When he embraced the monastic life, he still retained the possessions

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 22, &c.; 309, &c. La Légende Celtique, p. 127, &c. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 176–178.

His hospitality.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 45; 336.

which he had inherited from the king, his father, Saint Gwynlliw, and it is stated that at one Paschal time, 'he fed daily, at Llancarvan, one hundred clergy, and one hundred soldiers, and one hundred workmen, and one hundred poor, with the same number of widows. This,' proceeds the account, 'was the number of his family, besides serving-men and esquires, and well-dressed guests also, whose number was uncertain, and a multitude of whom frequently came to him.'

His cheerfulness.

De la Villemarqué, La Légende Celtique, p. 192.

St. Cadoc was remarkable for inculcating a spirit of cheerfulness, and of confidence in God. 'God,' he said, 'is always more and more abounding in the blessings He bestows upon those who worship Him; the devil always heaps more and more evils on those who serve him.' 'Happy,' he cried, 'is the man of pure life; light is the heart of the songster.' His monks mingled holy singing with their devotions.

Ibid. p. 157.

'Song,' said St. Cadoc, 'keeps up cheerfulness.'

His love of God and man.

Catholic Catechism.

Several of the most eminent of the Welsh bards, as well as clergy, were numbered amongst the disciples of St. Cadoc, who himself is counted amongst the bards. There is still extant a collection of his maxims and moral sayings, by which, as by his life, he taught the one end of man, the same in all ages and generations:—'To know God, to love Him and serve Him in this world, and to be happy for ever with Him in the next.'

La Légende Celtique, p. 165.

'No one,' sang St. Cadoc, 'loves God without finding happiness;' 'Love is heaven;' 'Hate is hell;'

'Conscience is the eye of God in the soul of man.' And, in happy distinction from other British poets who have been quoted, he denounced alike in one and the same sentence as amongst the objects of his hatred, 'the judge who loves money,' and 'the bard who loves war.'

Ibid. p. 183.

'There is no true patriot,' said St. Cadoc, 'but the man who tills the ground.'

La Légende Celtique, p. 165.

After completing his more youthful studies, he had sailed over to Ireland, to become instructed in 'all the science of the West,' and on his return he put himself under one Bachan, who had lately arrived in Brecknockshire from Italy, in order 'to be taught by him Latin, in the Roman way.' He delighted in the poems of Virgil, and shed bitter tears at the thought that their author had died a heathen. This occurred during a conversation with St. Gildas, when St. Cadoc had taken refuge in a small island off the coast of Brittany. He connected this island with the main land by a bridge of granite, that the people might come to his church, and the children to his schools.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 36; 326, 327.

La Légende Celtique, p. 202.

His memory held in honour.

In Brittany, as in Wales whilst still Catholic, the memory of St. Cadoc was loved and honoured through succeeding generations. Three hundred and fifty years after his abode in their country, the warriors of Brittany invoked his intercession in their struggle against 'the detested English;' and when they returned victorious from the combat, their triumphant chant proclaimed, that—'In paradise, as upon earth, St. Cadoc has no equal!'

Ibid. pp. 222–224.

St. Cadoc now forgotten in Wales.

The hills and valleys of old Wales, so dear to the patriotic heart of Cadoc, where once his praise resounded and his fellow-countrymen sought his aid with God, now echo his name no more; and his memory scarce survives throughout his native land, save in the names of antique churches and the antiquarian's catalogue of men and of things gone by. Yet that beloved spot, Llancarvan, which his biographer describes as 'his residence in his own dear country,'—*sui cari ruris sedes Landcarvan*,—was in Wales; whilst, though a benefactor wherever he might be, in Brittany he only sojourned as a stranger. From what other cause but that of the religion of the people does it then arise, that whilst St. Cadoc is well-nigh forgotten in his own native land which he loved and served so well, his memory still lives cherished in the warm affection of the peasantry of Brittany, by whom, in this nineteenth century, St. Cadoc is still known, and loved, and venerated? Glamorganshire has no village festival on old Llancarvan's site, to honour St. Cadoc's works of charity and of piety, and to ask his blessing still. But it is otherwise with his island in Catholic Brittany, as may be learnt from M. de la Villemarqué's touching account of St. Cadoc's autumn feast. It forms the concluding portion of St. Cadoc's legend, and it runs as follows:—

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 38; 328.

St. Cadoc is still honoured in Catholic Brittany.

La Légende Celtique, pp. 225-227.

'The return of autumn, and the grape gathering on some of the shores of the Morbihan, the apple gathering in Cornouaille' (in Brittany), 'every year bring round, in these two countries, the feast of the Welsh saint who, more

than thirteen centuries ago, fell off from life as the ripe fruit falls off from the tree in autumn. All his chapels open to the joy; pilgrims flock to them with chants, and the offerings in them are abundant,—corn, flax, wax, honey,—all the presents brought by summer, crowned by the gifts of the heart. But it is chiefly towards the little isle of the saint that the Breton pilgrims crowd; the boats do not suffice to convey them from the other islands of the Cornouaille and of the Morbihan. The bridge is too narrow for the multitude who press over it; the church, above all, is too small to hold them, and the *flat site*, planted with oaks that shade it, is turned into another church. What say I? It is the island altogether which becomes the temple of the saint, when, with mitre on head and cross in hand, borne on the shoulders of four sailors of the Morbihan, preceded by his old banner and his cross of shining silver, followed by a little ship—a remembrance of that which brought him to Armorica—he makes the round of his domain to the sound of bells, the singing of canticles, and the splashing of the waves, blessing the orchards and the gardens which he cultivated himself, and which he has so often blessed. Kneeling as he passes, women, children, old men implore his benediction; whilst inside the chapel, for a moment almost empty, some poor Breton soldier of our French army, come back maimed from our last wars, has himself laid on the bed of stone where slept the soldier of Christ, places his head on the granite pillow where he placed his head, his heart on the place where beat the heart of the friend of the warriors of Brittany, and asks of the holy bishop-martyr healing, if it be the will of God; or "patience in suffering, that he may merit paradise."'

Thus ancient Brittany still holds fast the faith of Rome, and the memory of St. Cadoc closely knitted with it through tradition immemorial. Contrast.

In Wales, St. Cadoc's churches witness the pro-

fession of the English religion; and St. Cadoc himself, that great ornament and benefactor of the country, the same country which gave him birth, is as little cared for as is the faith of Rome.

If Rome and the British Cadoc are thus inseparably loved and blended now in the true christian hearts and coeval traditions of an ancient people; if where Rome is now rejected, Cadoc also is forgotten, and that in his own dear land; who shall say that Rome and Cadoc were sundered in past days, whilst Cadoc was on earth?

St. Cadoc at Weedon.

La Légende Celtique, p. 211, &c.

There is an interesting tradition that St. Cadoc, after leaving Brittany to return to Wales or to visit Scotland, went ultimately to Weedon in Northamptonshire, in order to minister to the spiritual needs of British Christians still remaining in that region under the yoke of the pagan Saxons, and that there, whilst he was engaged in offering the divine sacrifice, a band of heathen Saxons broke into the church, whose chief with a thrust of his lance slew the man of God at the very altar. With his parting breath, St. Cadoc implored the blessing of the Lord Jesus upon his nation;—'Above all,' such were his last words, 'be merciful to them, that after having honoured Thee on earth they may glorify Thee in heaven!'

He is there slain at the altar.

His eulogium.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 80; 375, 376.

'O truly blessed man,' exclaims his old Catholic biographer concerning him, 'in whom no guile was found, who unjustly judged no one, who held no one in contempt. Never was he seen to be excessive in joy or sorrow, excepting at the hour of his prayers,

which he offered with tears to God. Never was he seen to be broken down by adversity, or elated by prosperity. Christ alone was in his mouth, and what for Christ's sake appertained to advancement in the correction of human nature; in his heart there was only peace, and patient piety, with mercy. Day by day, he, the elect temple of the Divine Spirit, searched by the Holy Ghost into those things which were not his own but Jesus Christ's.'

Numerous churches in Wales are dedicated to St. Cadoc, of a large number of which he was himself the founder.

Welsh Saints, p. 177, and Appendix iii.

His popular history is replete with marvels. The following story may be cited from amongst them, as evidence that faith in the pilgrimage to Rome, and belief in the primacy of the Roman pontiff, retained their natural place in the christianity of the ancient British nation, as in that of all other Catholics.

Evidence of visible communion with Rome.

It is related that, on one occasion, St. Cadoc was visited, at Llancarvan, by a certain Briton from Ireland on his way to Rome, who was an eminent scholar, and an excellent writer, as well as a skilful artist. This was none other than the celebrated Gildas, the son of Caw, and he carried with him 'a most beautiful little bell' which he had made, 'composed of various metals.' St. Cadoc, who entertained him for the night, earnestly examined and struck the bell; upon which, being delighted with its beauty and sound and colour, he implored of the artist that he would allow him to purchase it; and

The bell of St. Cadoc.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 59, &c.; 351, &c.

at last he offered to give him for it as much pure gold as it would contain. But the artist strenuously refused, 'asserting that he had vowed it with a vow to God and to St. Peter,' and he went on his way with his bell. Having arrived in Rome, he submitted it to the Pope's inspection, expressing his intention to 'offer it to God and to St. Peter on his altar.' But when 'the same chief Pontiff of the Apostolic See,' carefully examining the bell, endeavoured to try its sound, the bell was mute. The Pope, greatly astonished, requested an explanation from the pilgrim. 'Tell me,' he said, 'for whom it last sounded.'

'But the pilgrim made answer,—"My Lord, a certain holy man, named Cadoc, living in Britain, received me at his hospice in this journey of pilgrimage, who, being the last that struck the present bell, made it resound with a dulcet tone." To whom the Pope replied,—"The man of whom thou speakest was previously known to me, for he has been here seven times on pilgrimage, and thrice to Jerusalem, for the pardon of the souls of his relatives and friends." The Pope again took the bell, and blessed it, and said,—"Carry back this bell blessed and consecrated by me to the blessed Cadoc, in order that in this mouth the most important oaths may be made, and may become the firm refuge of all Britain. For the Britons also will reverence this bell for two reasons: both because it is blessed by me, and because it will be the property of the holy Cadoc."' In obedience to the Pope, the pilgrim

carried back the bell to St. Cadoc, at Llancarvan, and informed him of all things which the Pope had enjoined concerning it. 'Therefore again more eagerly than before St. Cadoc received the holy bell, and he forthwith struck the same with his own hands, to produce melodious sounds; which bell, instantly sounding, gave forth from itself sweet melody, which it had before refused in the presence of the Pope.'

The truth of this story is, no doubt, as questionable as that of the statement which follows it, viz. that this same bell 'twice spoke with human speech, and also spoke a third time.'

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 60; 353.

But it is not likely that such a legend would have obtained currency, and have survived for generations, if, at the period to which it refers, there had been no visible interchange of ecclesiastical communion between the British church and the See of Rome.

It has been well observed by Sir Francis Palgrave, in reference to such 'traditional opinions,' that they 'are not to be engrafted into history as facts; but yet they are usually the recollections of facts, and not without their value in elucidating the transactions of remote periods, and in connecting and explaining the fragments of information which we possess.'

History of the Anglo-Saxons, p. 89, ed. Tegg, 1867.

There can be no doubt that the Gildas of the legend which has been cited, was the celebrated historian and saint of that name, who, like St. Cadoc, bore the cognomen of 'the Wise,' and whose practice of making bells is more than once alluded to.

St. Gildas.

The bell of St. Illtyd.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 175; 485, 486.

It is related that St. Illtyd was drawn to the mouth of a cave where he had retired near the wayside, by the sweet tones of a brazen bell, given forth of its own accord, whilst it was being carried from the 'historian Gildas,' who had made it, 'to St. David, the Bishop, as a present, in memory of past companionship and affection.' St. Illtyd sounded the bell, and enquired to whom 'the beautiful thing, more precious than gold,' was on its way. When the bell reached St. David, it was mute; he asked who had sounded it, and on learning what had occurred, he immediately sent it back to St. Illtyd, perceiving, he said, that he had desired it but had been unwilling to express his desire, and that it was not the will of the Lord that he should retain it himself.

The bell of St. Bridget.

Bolland. Act. SS. 29 Jan. Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. i. p. 130, &c.

There is a story also in the old life of St. Gildas, written by a monk of his own convent of Rhuys, which tells how the celebrated Abbess, St. Bridget, in Ireland, having heard the good report of St. Gildas, which spread far and near, sent to bid him 'rejoice and be strong in the Lord,' and begged of him some token of his sanctity, as a memorial. Upon which St. Gildas with his own hands made a little bell, which St. Bridget received 'with joy, and as a heavenly gift.'

Country and parentage of St. Gildas.

St. Gildas was a Briton of Strath-Clyde, having been born in the region of Alcluyd, now Dumbarton. His father's name was Caunus, 'a most noble and a Catholic man,' says the ancient biographer above mentioned. He was educated, when young,

in the school of St. Illtyd, and afterwards he studied in Ireland. He made great proficiency both in learning and in sanctity, and, when promoted to the priesthood, he is said to have preached the faith with remarkable success, amongst the heathen and amongst certain heretics, in the northern parts of Britain. It appears that St. Gildas visited Ireland more than once, and that he taught for some time at Armagh, besides labouring everywhere throughout that country in the cause of religion, and bringing together many both from amongst the noble and the poor, to serve God in the monasteries which he established. Thus his life furnishes one out of the frequent examples found in history, of the intimate connection which existed in those early ages between the British and Irish churches.

His education and life.

He is said to have also taught for a while in the British monastery of Llancarvan, and then to have retired with St. Cadoc, to an island called Echni, now the Flat-Holm, in the Bristol Channel, for the sake of religious retirement and contemplation. On this occasion, St. Gildas wrote out a book of the Gospels, which Butler says was long preserved with great care, and highly reverenced by the Welsh, who used it in their most solemn oaths.

Butler, Life of St. Cadoc. Jan. 24.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 66; 360.

'After these things,' says the before-mentioned monk of Rhuys, 'forsaking Ireland and Britain, and leaving all his own people, Blessed Gildas, setting forth on a pilgrimage, went to Rome, to implore assistance from the merits of St. Peter and St. Paul,

The pilgrimage of St. Gildas to Rome.

in order that by their intercession he might obtain from the Lord forgiveness of his sins, with perseverance in God's service, and might deserve to be united to all the saints in the heavenly country.'

He retires into solitude.

After this pilgrimage, St. Gildas lived for a while in religious solitude in a small island near the coast of Brittany, but in consequence of the large numbers who sought from him instruction and spiritual guidance, he afterwards founded the monastery of Rhuys, on the mainland. It was there that, at the request of 'religious brethren who came to him from Britain,' he wrote his vigorous denunciation of the crimes and disorders which he describes as so prevalent amongst the British people. Before his death he again retired to his neighbouring beloved island of retirement, where, surrounded by his monks, he passed to a better life, with words of benediction on his lips. '"The God of peace and of love," he prayed, "be always with you all." And when all had responded, "Amen," he yielded up the ghost, on the fourth calends of February, old and full of days,' about the year 570.[1]

He founds a monastery.

His dying benediction.

[1] It is impossible to arrive with any certainty at the precise dates of the deaths of these early British saints. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind that they frequently attained to a remarkable length of life. Butler (Note to *Life of St. Gildas the Wise*, Jan. 29) refers to Dom. Maurice, as showing that about one hundred and twenty years formed an ordinary term of human life amongst the ancient Britons. The same Butler (Jan. 29) gives the separate lives of two saints of the name of Gildas; but the more approved opinion seems to be that of Fr. Bollandus (Act. SS. 29 Jan.), who regards them both as one and the same

St. Gildas is commemorated in several martyrologies, though he is not mentioned in the Roman. The village in Brittany where his monastery was situated, still bears the name of St. Gildas-de-Ruys, and the peasants of that Catholic country cease not to invoke the intercession of the ancient British Saint, especially with the object of obtaining cures in cases of madness.

Bolland. Act. SS. 29 Jan. De S. Gilda, § v.

Bouillet, Dict. d'Histoire et de Géographie.

St. Paul, Bishop of Léon, in Brittany, was a native either of Cornwall or of Wales, and another disciple of St. Illtyd, by whose advice he embraced the life of a hermit. He was ordained priest in Britain about the year 530. Afterwards he crossed the sea, and retired to a small island off the coast of Brittany, but ultimately he passed over to the mainland, where he preached the faith to the pagan people. Greatly against his inclination, he was consecrated Bishop of Léon, an ancient city, which now bears the name of St. Pol de Léon, in memory of the British St. Paul. He founded a monastery in the island of Bas, in a house which had formed the residence of the governor of the country, who bestowed it on him. Here he placed fervent monks, who had accompanied him from Wales and Cornwall. Afterwards, resigning his bishopric to one of his disciples, he retired to the same island, and there he died about the year 573.

St. Paul of Léon, Butler's Lives, March 12.

The holy Bishop, St. Leonorus, was also a disciple

St. Leonorus, Butler, July 1. Bolland. Act. SS. 1 Julii.

person, and this is the view maintained by Dr. Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ireland*, vol. i. pp. 476, &c.) against Ussher and others.

of St. Illtyd, and belonged to a noble family in Wales. Having passed over into Brittany, he there founded a monastery. He is the patron of many churches, and in particular, he has left his name to the parish church of St. Lunaire, to which his relics were translated.

St. Malo.

Butler, Nov. 15. Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. ii. pp. 33, 34.

St. Lunaire is situated near the flourishing seaport which derives its name from St. Malo, or Maclou, who in the sixth century was Bishop of the neighbouring see of Aletum, or Aleth, afterwards transferred to St. Malo. By some authors he is stated to have been a native of Glamorganshire in South Wales, and, though others maintain that his birthplace was in Brittany, his father very probably was Welsh, and there is no doubt that his mother was so. Through her, St. Malo was first-cousin to the two Welsh Saints, Sampson and Maglorius.

Visible communion between the British and French churches.

Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. Bened. t. i. pp. 180, 181.

The history of St. Malo affords one out of many instances of the visible interchange of ecclesiastical communion, between the christians of Brittany, who were identified with their kindred in Great Britain, and the church of Gaul, to which, after their migration, they belonged. It is related that St. Malo, having been driven away from Aleth by the assaults of the wicked, committed himself to the waves, and landed on the shores of Aquitaine. Having learnt, upon enquiry, that the people were Catholic, and that the neighbouring See of Saintes was governed by the blessed Leontius, 'he went to him with confidence, and was most warmly received by him.' 'Meanwhile,' it is said, 'Brittany

bewailed as an exile, him whom Saintes rejoiced to entertain as a guest,' and, at the entreaty of his people, St. Malo returned to them. But he afterwards went back to the neighbourhood of Saintes, and being met by Leontius, they embraced each other with joy, and passed several days together, conversing on divine things, and giving praise to God. When Leontius returned to his abode, St. Malo remained at the place of meeting, which is described as 'pleasant and suitable for prayer.' Here St. Malo died, about the years 565–570, or, possibly, as late as A.D. 620.

St. Sampson. Bolland. Act. SS. 28 Julii. Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. i. p. 154.

Saint Sampson, first cousin to St. Malo, was one of the most distinguished men of his time and country, and, as was the case with so many who then attained to eminence, he was a disciple of St. Illtyd. He was born in the British province of Demetia, which lay on the west side of Wales, and comprised the modern St. David's. His parents belonged to that country; they were noble and pious, and for a long time childless, till Sampson was given, in answer to their unwearying and fervent supplications. Whilst in the monastery of St. Illtyd he was ordained deacon and priest by St. Dubricius, and it is said, that whenever he offered the divine sacrifice, he saw the angels of God assisting him at the altar. With the consent of St. Illtyd, he subsequently placed himself in another convent, under the direction of a priest named Piro, for the sake of greater retirement. Here, unceasingly, by night and by day he worshipped

and conversed with his God. His days were spent in manual labour and in prayer, his nights in meditation, and in study of the Holy Scriptures. The rest which he could not dispense with, he took leaning against the wall, or stretched on the ground, or on a board; never in a bed.

Instances of disorder.

The life from which I take this account, is given by Dom. Mabillon, as well as by the Bollandist Father Sollerius, as of great antiquity; in fact, as nearly of contemporary date, *auctore anonymo subæquali*; and it is worthy of note, that it contains evident indications of the existence of those disorders which are so freely exposed by Gildas, as too commonly to be found amongst the British clergy of that age, notwithstanding the numerous and brilliant exceptions now mentioned. Thus, we are told in the said biography, of the jealousy excited by St. Sampson's exemplary mode of life, and by the regard which it gained for him from St. Illtyd, his preceptor, as well as from St. Dubricius, his bishop; so that when he was in the monastery of the former, certain brethren even mixed poison in his cup; and when he belonged to the community of Piro, he was falsely accused by one of the monks, of having wasted the contents of the cellar, which was entrusted to him. From both these attacks he was miraculously delivered.

Piro, the Abbot, was soon after killed by an accident, having fallen into a large pit, in the convent precincts, on a dark night, when the said Abbot, it was whispered, was somewhat the worse for his

potations.[1] It may charitably be hoped that this was a libel on poor Abbot Piro; or, at any rate that it was not his habit to offend against temperance, for had it been so St. Sampson would hardly have joined his community.

It appears, however, that Piro's monks were by no means averse to conviviality, for we are further told that when St. Sampson had been elected Abbot in the place of Piro, the brethren accounted him more of a hermit than a community monk. 'Amidst abundant banquets and overflowing cups'—strange accompaniments of monastic life!—'he made it his business,' says his biographer, 'to be always hungry and thirsty.'[2]

[1] The following are the words in the original text:—'Idem Piro in tenebrosâ nocte, et quod est gravius, ut aiunt, per ineptam ebrietatem in claustra monasterii deambulans, solus in puteum valde vastum se præcipitavit, atque unum clamorem ululatus emittens, a fratribus fere mortuus a lacu abstractus est, et ob hoc ea nocte obiit.'—Cap. iv. n. 36, Vita, in *Bolland. Act. SS.* 28 Julii. In a previous chapter (cap. ii. n. 20) the Abbot Piro is described as 'an eminent man and a holy priest,' the strange contrast of which words with the reported manner of Piro's death, called forth from the Abbot Guibert the following indignant remarks, quoted by the Bollandist Fr. Sollerius (*not. i., in loc. citat.*):—'Legi, testor Deum, et iis qui mihi præsto fuerant, cum nimia detestatione relegi, scilicet in vita S. Samsonis, celeberrimi apud Francos et Britones Sancti, abbatem quemdam, quem S. Pironem lectio illa agnominat: cujus cum finem ut beatum putabam, rite legendo prosequenter, reperi cumulum sanctitatis, hominem videlicet ebrietate madentem, in puteum incedisse, sicque enectum.'

[2] . . . . eremitam se plusquam cœnobitam monachum fratres judicabant. Studebat itaque inter dapes abundantes et pocula inundantia jejunus semper et sitiens esse.'—*Vita*, cap. iv. n. 36.

St. Sampson visits Ireland and returns. Vita, cap. iv. n. 37.

A year and a half after his elevation as Abbot, St. Sampson, with the permission of his bishop, St. Dubricius, made a journey into Ireland, in the company of certain learned men of that country who had stopped at his monastery on their way from Rome. On his return to Britain he led the life of a hermit, in a cave, till called forth to a synod in which, against his will, he was again made Abbot of a certain monastery said to have been founded by St. German, where it was the custom for the bishops to assemble on the feast of the chair of St. Peter the Apostle.

bid. cap. iv. n. 42.

Is consecrated Bishop.

Here St. Sampson was consecrated Bishop by St. Dubricius, in consequence of a heavenly revelation; or, if the ancient history be true,[1] St. Dubricius and his counsellors acknowledged him to have been miraculously consecrated in a vision by the holy Apostles, Peter, James, and John, and so placed him in the episcopal chair.

Becomes established in Brittany.

St. Sampson afterwards went over into Brittany, to minister to the spiritual needs of the many emigrants from his own land. He founded there the monastery of Dol, which became his residence. Dol was at one period regarded as their metropolitan see by the Britons in that country, and St. Sampson is sometimes styled its Archbishop.

Hard. Act. Concil. t. iii. col. 340.

The signature of St. Sampson may still be seen

[1] These old lives of the saints abound in the marvellous, but their evidence is most important as to the main facts which they relate, though the truth of the embellishment may often be called in question, as well as, occasionally, the accessory circumstances.

attached to the acts of a council held in Paris, in the year 557, as follows:—

Samson peccator episcopus consensi et subscripsi.

Several of the other bishops also attached the appellation of 'peccator' to their signatures.

St. Sampson's crosses. Essay on the Welsh Saints, pp. 255, 256.

Rice Rees mentions that the Welsh accounts state, without assigning any reason, that St. Sampson returned from Armorica to the college of St. Illtyd, and there died; and that two large stone crosses still remain in the churchyard of Lantwit Major (Llanilltyd) with his name. One of these crosses has three several inscriptions; the first of which intimates that the cross is that of Iltutus and Sampson; the second that Sampson erected it for his soul; and the third that one Samuel was the carver. The other cross has only one inscription, but it is longer and more legible than those of the above named. It states that the cross on which it is found, was prepared by Sampson for the repose of his soul, and for the souls of Juthael the king, and Arthmael. There was an Armorican chieftain, called Juthael, who was a friend of St. Sampson of Dol, and from this it may be gathered that it was St. Sampson of Dol who erected the cross; and that the name upon it was not intended to designate another Sampson, styled Archbishop of York, who is said to have taken refuge from the Saxons at Llanilltyd about this time, and to have passed there the latter part of his life.

Ibid. pp. 228, 229.

Death of St. Sampson.

But it is to be observed that the above-mentioned crosses do not designate the place of St. Sampson's death or burial, and, according to the ancient life already quoted, it was in his own monastery at Dol, 'having built up and fortified,' says his biographer, 'the catholic churches after the example of his life,' that 'his blessed soul went forth happily to Christ, amidst the hymns of the angelic choirs, which were heard by the brethren at the time that it passed away.'

Its date.

St. Sampson died during the latter half of the sixth century. The year 565 is the date assigned by Dom. Mabillon and the early Bollandist writer, Fr. Sollerius. But the more recent Bollandist, Fr. Van Hecke, gives reasons for placing it about the year 590.

Bolland. Act. SS. Oct. t. x. pp. 773–776.

St. Sampson's relics brought to England.

De gest. Pontif. l. 2, inter Rer. Anglic. Script. post Bedam, p. 251, ed. Savile.

It is related in the writings of William of Malmesbury, that, early in the tenth century, Athelstan, King of England, deposited in his newly-founded Abbey at Middleton, many relics of Saints from Brittany, and that amongst them were pre-eminent 'the bones of most blessed Sampson, formerly Archbishop of Dol, a most holy and altogether worthy man of God.' It is evident therefore, that neither the Saxon monarch, nor the monastic chronicler, regarded the communion of which St. Sampson was so eminent a member, as outwardly separated from Rome and the universal church.

Nor could the Bishops with whom he sat in Synod in Paris have considered it to be so.

Nor was it so accounted by the Roman and

universal church, for in the Roman martyrology St. Sampson is commemorated as 'Bishop and Confessor,' amongst the Saints there enumerated by name under the date of the 28th of July.

St. Magloire.

St. Sampson was succeeded in the Bishopric, and in the rule of the Abbey of Dol, by his cousin St. Maglorius, or Magloire, a native of his own part of Wales, and also a disciple of St. Illtyd. He had crossed the sea with St. Sampson into Brittany. According to the opinion of the Bollandist Fr. Van Hecke, St. Maglorius was born about the year 525, and accompanied St. Sampson into Gaul about the year 555. Previous to this he had been ordained deacon by St. Sampson, who also, when at the point of death, named him as his successor in the Episcopate. This was about the year 590, according to the above-quoted Fr. Van Hecke.

Bolland. Act. SS. 24 Octobris.

Bolland. Act. SS. 24 Octobris. Comment. Præv. § i. n. 12.

St. Maglorius retires.

Four years afterwards, warned by an angelic vision, St. Maglorius withdrew into retirement, after consecrating his disciple, or companion, Budoc, as Bishop in his place. The people, nevertheless, flocked to him from all parts, for cure both of soul and body, many of them being laden with rich presents, which he at once bestowed upon the poor.

The people flock to him.

He consults Bishop Budoc.

Saint Magloire, full of anxiety on finding his beloved solitude thus invaded, and his spirit of poverty thus assailed, revealed his troubles, with tears, to his successor, Bishop Budoc, who counselled him not to shrink from the labour of love, but to imitate our Lord Christ, who while reposing in His Father's

bosom, came down into this world to heal the infirmities of the sick.

His mode of life.

Saint Magloire gave heed to the advice, and shortly afterwards a rich count having been healed from a seven-years' leprosy, through his prayers and touch, bestowed upon him a tract of land in the island of Sark. Here the Saint built a church, and founded a monastery of sixty-two monks, to whom, as to every one who knew him, he gave an example of all virtues. He concealed his shirt of hair under garments neither vile nor rich, but ordinary, that he might avoid the snare of human praise. On Wednesdays and Fridays he took no food at all; on festivals, at the entreaty of his monks, he partook of a few small fish; but his ordinary diet was a spare allowance of barley bread and common vegetables. By night, whilst others slept, he would steal out unperceived and keep his lonely vigils on the dark ocean shore, till the hour came round for matins. He was a model of chastity from his childhood. To all he was forward in hospitality, remembering that 'God loveth a cheerful giver.' 'All the virtues,' says his ancient biographer, 'enumerated by the vessel of election, the apostle Paul, seem to have been added to him; that is, "charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency," and, as has been said, "chastity."'

2 Cor. ix. 7.

Gal. v. 22, 23.

Angelic announcement

When his course was nearly run, an angel sent from God announced to him the welcome tidings of

his approaching dissolution, telling him that he was about to be adorned amidst the choirs of virgins, with the crown of those who bring forth fruit an hundred-fold. After this heavenly vision he never left the church, but there he abided till the day of his glad decease, constantly repeating holy King David's prayer,—*One thing I have asked of the Lord, this will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life.*

of the approach of his death.

Ps. xxvi. 4.

The Bollandist Father Van Hecke, places the death of St. Magloire about the year 605. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 24th of October, and it is there stated that his sacred body reposes in Paris. It was removed from Sark into Brittany in the year 849. From the fact that this circumstance is not mentioned in the Life which has been quoted, it may be concluded that it was written at a period prior to that date.

Its date. Act. SS. 24 Oct.

It is well known that the region of Armorica, or Lesser Britain, now called Brittany, in Gaul, afforded a refuge for many of the fugitives from the Saxon invaders of the island of Great Britain. It is stated in the above-quoted Life of St. Maglorius, that the object of St. Sampson in bidding farewell to his kindred and crossing the ocean, 'together with the blessed Maglorius and a company of certain clergy as well as laymen,' was to preach to these British refugees (*ad prædicandum populo ejusdem linguæ*). They formed a distinct national body, and they appear to have carried with them, and to have been spiritually

The Armorican Britons.

Cap. i. n. 3.

ruled by, bishops and clergy of their own. Their bishops were subject to the metropolitan see of Tours, and thus held a recognised position in the great catholic church of Gaul.

Position of the British Bishops in France.

So early as the year 461, amongst the signatures to the acts of the first council of Tours, we find that of Mansuetus, who there styles himself 'Bishop of the Britons,'—*Mansuetus episcopus Britannorum interfui et subscripsi.*

Hard. Act. Concil. t. ii. col. 796.

It has also been seen that St. Sampson took part in the council of Paris in the year 557; and the council of Tours, A.D. 567, by its ninth canon forbad the consecration in Armorica, of any Briton or Gaul as Bishop, without the consent of the Metropolitan, or of the co-provincial Bishops. Thus the British in that country were distinctly recognised as a portion of the church of Gaul. When the above-named canon was enacted, the rights of the metropolitan see were perhaps thought to be menaced through the new pretensions of Dol.

Hard. Act. Concil. t. iii. col. 359.

There were several subsequent councils of Tours before the middle of the ninth century, but neither the names of the Bishops who took part in them, nor those of their sees, have been preserved. However, in the year 866, the third council of Soissons addressed a letter to Pope St. Nicholas I., in which the assembled prelates complained that for nearly one and twenty years the Bishops of Brittany had absented themselves from the councils of their own province of Tours; that they did not in any way submit to

Ibid. t. v. col. 627.

the metropolitan authority of that see; and further, that they did not assist either by presence, by legates, or by letters, at the more general councils of Gaul.

This renders it evident that down to the year 845, the bishops of Brittany were in the habit of assisting at the provincial councils of Tours; and that their participation therein, as well as in the larger councils of the bishops of the various provinces of Gaul, was expected and required, as being one of the duties attached to their local ecclesiastical position. No further proof can be needed that the Continental British church in Armorica, with which the British churches of Wales, and of other parts of the island, were so intimately united during the sixth century, formed a visible, notable, and integral portion of the great catholic church of Gaul, so conspicuous at that time for its allegiance to the apostolic see of Rome.

Political position of Brittany.

The resistance of the bishops of Brittany to the metropolitan authority of Tours, and their consequent neglect of the summons to attend the councils of that province, originated in a political effort to render Brittany independent of the Frankish domination; but the ecclesiastical resistance continued long after the political effort had failed. Tours belonged to the Franks, and Nomenoy, who was the Duke of Brittany from A.D. 825 to A.D. 851, and who endeavoured to constitute himself an independent sovereign, was unwilling that the bishops of his

territory should remain subject to a Frankish archbishopric. He therefore set up Dol in the place of Tours, as the metropolitan see of Brittany, it being alleged in behalf of Dol that it had been so constituted at the time of St. Sampson. But throughout the contest, the supreme authority of the Roman see was never called in question. Nomenoy himself concurred in the appeal made to Rome by certain bishops of his dominions who were accused of simony; requesting St. Conwoion, Abbot of Redon in Brittany, to accompany them, and to assist in the discussion of their cause. This occurred during the pontificate of St. Leo IV., A.D. 847-855. 'At the same time,' proceeds the ancient narrative, 'Prince Nomenoy transmitted a golden crown with most precious gems as a gift to the blessed Peter the Apostle, by the venerable man Conwoion, and commanded him to ask from blessed Leo the Pope, one of the holy bodies of the martyrs who had ruled the Roman church after blessed Peter the Apostle.' It is further stated that this deputation from Brittany was honourably received by the Pope, who presented his own chasuble which he was in the habit of wearing to St. Conwoion, and also sent to Duke Nomenoy the body of the Pope St. Marcellinus.

Vita S. Conwoionis, apud Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. vi. pp. 220–222.

Offerings to St. Peter.

Relics asked for;

Sent;

Solemnly welcomed. Ubi supra.

Nomenoy, accompanied by the chiefs and the Bishops of Brittany, hastened forth to meet the sacred relics, which were solemnly 'deposited in the church of Saint Saviour, with lauds and hymns, and great gladness; and the people rejoiced with a great joy

because they had been held worthy to receive a Vicar of holy Peter the Apostle in their province.' The faithful came from distant regions as well as from Brittany, to worship at the shrine, and Christ displayed His servant's merits through the miracles there wrought.

Salomon, who was honoured with the title of King, succeeded Nomenoy in the rule of Brittany, A.D. 851. Pope St. Nicholas I. in a brief which he addressed to him respecting ecclesiastical matters, took occasion to observe that the Archbishop of Tours was the Metropolitan of Brittany, and that all the bishops of Brittany were the suffragans of the said Archbishop of Tours. But it is evident from the same epistle, that the Pope did not intend this to be regarded as a final decision, for he proceeds to advise King Salomon, in case he is not satisfied, to bring the matter for further investigation before the tribunal of the Roman see. The dispute continued for more than three centuries. It was not until the year 1199, that it was ultimately decided by Pope Innocent III. His judgment fully confirmed the ancient rights and prerogatives of Tours.

Hard. Act. Concil. t. ii. col. 796.

The claims of Tours confirmed by Rome.

Epist. Innocentii III. lib. ii. ep. 82. &c. t. i. pp. 388, &c. ed. Baluz. Paris, 1682.

Up to that time the Armorican Britons had been as pertinacious in their rejection of the authority of the Frankish See of Tours, as the Welsh Britons ever were in their refusal of subjection to the Saxon See of Canterbury; and the French prelates, assembled at Soissons in the council already referred to, A.D. 866, complained of the Armorican Britons to

Pertinacity of the Armorican Britons.

the Pope, in language as strong[1] as could ever have been used by any Saxon prelate concerning the Welsh. Yet so notorious were the constancy and fidelity of these continental Britons in their allegiance to the Catholic Church, and to its centre, the See of Rome, that the ambassadors of the Duke of Brittany, on taking the oaths, in his name, to Pope Pius II., in the year 1459, made also a solemn protestation declaring that, not only in more recent times had their ancestors rejected the Gallican invention of the pragmatic sanction; but, that, from their first reception of the christian faith, they had never been guilty of apostasy; had never opposed the commands of the supreme See; and had never failed in their adherence to the Pontiffs who occupied it. This protestation was worded as follows:—

Their attachment to Rome.

Thomassin, Discip. de l'Eglise, P. ii. l. i. c. 46, n. ii.

'*Majores nostri, post accepta semel Christi sacra, nunquam apostatarunt; vixere Romanis legibus, nec unquam primæ Sedis mandatis adversati sunt. Pragmaticam Sanctionem, Gallicæ gentis inventum, respuerunt, prædecessoribus tuis constanti animo adhæserunt.*'

It was from their ancestors of the British Isle, that the inhabitants of Brittany in Gaul, derived their

Both qualities derived from their ancestors in Great Britain.

[1] After speaking of the absence of the bishops of Brittany from their councils, as before mentioned, their letter proceeds:—'Unde fit ut nullus cultus religionis inter eos, nullus disciplinæ vigor haberi possit in illis: quoniam cum sint barbari, feritate nimia tumidi, nullis sacris institutis obediunt, nullis præceptionibus sanctorum patrum se subdunt: sed pro libitu insipientiæ malevolentiæque suæ cuncta peragunt.'—Hard. *Act. Concil.*, t. v. col. 628.

unflinching spirit of independence, as well as the wild freedom of their manners so strongly complained of by the French. The British character, moreover, was pertinaciously opposed to any innovation upon ancient customs. It may therefore reasonably be inferred that the fidelity to the Roman See, which also formed so constant a characteristic of the British christians of Armorica, was an old-established and acknowledged usage of their race; not a virtue of recent introduction, but an ancient habit of the British people, and an integral part of the great national christian tradition; inherited as such by the churchmen of Brittany from their British forefathers of the island, and still shared in by their British brethren who continued to occupy portions of the same island, but who refused to hold communication with its Saxon invaders.

St. Padarn.

Bolland. Act. SS. 15 April. Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 188, &c.; 502, &c. Rice Rees. Welsh Saints. pp. 215–217.

Though migration from Great Britain to Armorica was a more general practice than the reverse, yet there are not wanting instances of migration from the Continent to Britain. Amongst these may be mentioned that of St. Padarn, or Paternus, who, crossing the ocean with several companions, placed himself for a time in the monastery of St. Illtyd, for instruction and spiritual guidance. His name is still recorded in the titles of several of the Welsh churches or chapels which he founded, or which have since been built under his patronage. The most important is that of Llanbadarn-Fawr, near Aberystwith, where he established a monastery which gave its name to an episcopal

see, of which he was consecrated the first bishop. After some time he returned to Brittany, and there became Bishop of Vannes, as is generally supposed.[1] In consequence of opposition from injurious and false brethren, St. Padarn afterwards retired into the country of the Franks, where he died.

The signature of a bishop named Paternus is attached to the acts of the council of Paris, A.D. 577; together with that of St. Sampson, which is mentioned above. But it is uncertain whether it belongs to our British Paternus, or to a Bishop of Avranches of the same period, who also bore that name, but who was from the region of Aquitaine.

Act. SS. 15 Ap. De S. Paterno.

I subjoin a short series of Latin verses in honour of the British St. Padarn, extracted from Ussher, by the Bollandist father Henschenius, as the composition of a son of Sulgenus; probably Ricemarchus, the author of the Life of St. David, who was himself Bishop of St. David's in the eleventh century, and who certainly would not have extolled St. Padarn as he did, if he had looked upon his communion as outwardly separated from the Roman and universal church.

The said verses describe St. Padarn's contempt of worldly vanities, his heavenly-mindedness and love of Christ, his austerities, labours, prayers, his fasts and vigils, sighs and tears, his active charity and

[1] Butler (April 15) appears to have been mistaken in describing him as the French Bishop of Avranches, of the same name, whose life is given separately by the Bollandist Fathers amongst the saints of April 16th.

hospitality, his prudence and his fortitude, as follows :—

'Hujus ad Arctoas locus est, metropolis alta,
Antistes sanctus quo duxit jure Paternus
Egregiam vitam, septenos terque per annos.
Omnia quæ mundi sunt vana et lubrica cernens,
Intendens animo cælestia numina toto,
Devovit Christo totum servire per ævum.
Ac etiam sanctum mactans cruciamine corpus,
Semper inexhausto persistens valde labore,
Orans, jejunans, vigilans, lacrymansque gemensque ;
Esuris alimenta simul, nexisque levamen,
Hospitibus pandens aditum, sitientibus haustum,
Ægrotis curam, nudis miseratus amictum :
Prudens quæque gerens, perfecit cuncta potenter ;
Ac sic lucifluum meruit conscendere regnum,
Cuncti quo Sancti miro splendore beantur.'

St. David.

Bolland. Act. SS. 1 Mart. Girald. Cambrens. de Vit. S. Dav. apud Wharton, Anglia Sacra, t. ii. p. 628. Ricemarchus, Ep. Menev. de Vit. S. Dav. Ibid. p. 645. Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 102, 117; 402, 418. Butler's Lives, March 1. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 191, &c. Lanigan, Hist. Eccl. Ireland, vol. i. pp. 469, &c.

The celebrated St. David belongs to the same sixth century. As a boy he was distinguished for virtue, and for proficiency in his studies. It has been stated that at one period he was a pupil of St. Illtyd, but whether this was the case or not, it appears that St. David was ordained priest before placing himself under the master whose name is principally connected with his own. This venerable preceptor was one Paulinus, or Pawl Hên, who is said to have been a disciple of St. Germanus, and to have passed some time, perhaps as a monk, in the monastery of St. Illtyd. He afterwards founded the Abbey of Whiteland in Carmarthenshire and, like so many others at that time, was Bishop as well as Abbot. He is honoured as the patron saint of the church of Llangors

Welsh Saints, pp. 187, 188.

in Brecknockshire, and of a chapel in Carmarthenshire called after him, Capel Peulin. In the neighbourhood of the latter there has been discovered an ancient monumental inscription, characteristically commemorating in the same line of somewhat peculiar versification, his fidelity to his faith, and his constant attachment to his country :—

> Servator fidei, patriæque semper amator,
> Hic Paulinus jacet, cultor pientissimus æqui.

St. David's mode of life.

After St. David had passed ten years under the instruction of Paulinus, who was celebrated for his knowledge of the holy scriptures, he was warned not to bury his talent in the ground, and he went forth and began to preach. He converted many from the vanity of the world and founded several monasteries, the principal being that of Menevia, which was under his own direction. Here, after God had freed him from the molestations of a neighbouring chieftain and his wife, he dwelt with a large community, in retirement and mortification, his eyes two fountains of holy tears, his heart on fire with love for God and for his neighbour. Daily with pure hands he offered the divine sacrifice, and afterwards in solitude he communed with his God and the holy Angels. Then straightway he plunged into frigid water, by a protracted stay in which he quenched the flames of fleshly concupiscence. He spent the whole remainder of the day without ever growing weary, in teaching and praying, in the care of his monks, in feeding a multitude of

orphans and widows, of needy, of sick, and of pilgrims. 'Thus,' says the biographer, 'he began, thus he persevered, and thus he ended.' His fame spread far and wide, and numbers sought admission to his community. Amongst other noble persons, it is said that Constantine, King of Cornwall, resigned his crown, and learnt obedience in the convent of holy David.

St. David's monastic rule.

His monks arose at cock-crow and gave themselves to prayer, after which they spent the first part of their day in hard manual labour in the woods and fields. On their return they occupied themselves in reading, writing, or praying, till the convent bell summoned them to the church, the call being instantly obeyed by each, even though the letter he had commenced in a manuscript, had to be left by him half formed. Their usual food was bread and vegetables, their clothing poor, mostly made of skins; superfluities they had none, and all things being in common there was no room for such words as 'mine' or 'thine.'

When any one sought for admission into the community he was made to wait ten days outside, as if a reprobate, and reviled in reproachful language. If he patiently persisted under all trials, he was taken in, but made to sweat with labour for a long time under the porter at the gate, and after he had been broken by many contrarieties (*fractus multis adversitatibus*), he was at length admitted into the fellowship of the brethren. Not one penny would the holy father David accept for the use of the monastery from those who joined it, but every new brother

'was received naked, as if escaping from shipwreck.'

Pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

At that time, according to the ancient narrative, in obedience to the admonition of an angel, the three saints, David, Theliau, and Padarn, met together, and proceeded in company on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; 'one in soul, in joy, and in sorrow.' An angel also forewarned the Bishop of Jerusalem of their approach, telling him that 'three catholic men were coming from the West, and that he was to afford them a glad reception and to consecrate them Bishops,' which injunction he accordingly obeyed.

St. David consecrated bishop.

The angel knew that St. David desired this pilgrimage; 'Take,' he said, 'the wished-for road.' *Optatam carpe viam.* It is possible that St. Dubricius may have sent the three holy men on this pilgrimage at their petition, and that on their way they may have visited Rome, and that the Pope may have directed the Bishop of Jerusalem to consecrate them bishops in the holy city; St. Dubricius and the Pope being designated in the popular tradition as two angels (a term for bishops), and literally so accounted, by the lovers of the marvellous, or the copyists. However this may be, it was not unusual at that time for the Abbot of a large monastery to be also consecrated Bishop, and such, as it appears, was the case with St. David.

The synod of Brevi.

After St. David's return, whilst he was again intently occupied in training himself and his monks for heaven, and in kindred works of mercy, a synod

of bishops and clergy was assembled at Brevi (now Llanddewi-Brefi), in Cardiganshire, in consequence of the revival of the Pelagian heresy. A multitude of the princes and laity were also there collected, but when the clergy attempted to address them, one after another failed in the endeavour; their words proving scarcely intelligible even to those who were the nearest to them. St. David, who had remained in his retirement, was then sent for by the synod, at the request of his former preceptor Paulinus. He entreated, being such as he was, not to be asked to attempt what others were unable to accomplish, and it was not till solicited by St. Dubricius and St. Daniel in person, that he consented to go, though he protested he could not preach, but would give what little help he could by prayer. When he entered the synod the Bishops and all the multitude were filled with joy. They asked him to preach, and he would not be disobedient to their word. With the voice of a trumpet he proclaimed the catholic truth; the heresy was expelled, and the true faith established in the minds of the people; so that all men united in giving 'thanks to God and to St. David.'

St. David succeeds St. Dubricius in the Archbishopric.

This synod is said to have been held about the year 519. St. Dubricius, the venerable Archbishop of Caerleon, now full of years and labours, availed himself of the occasion to resign his high pastoral charge in favour of St. David, and retired to the island of Bardsey, there to end his days in prayer and meditation. St. David having been constituted

his successor in the archbishopric, obtained either then or shortly afterwards, that the metropolitan see should be transferred from Caerleon to Menevia.

The synod of Victory. Annal. Eccl. Menev. apud Wharton, Angl. Sac. t. ii. p. 648.

After some years, another important synod was convened by St. David, at Caerleon, according to the Annals of the Church of Menevia, in which the acts of that of Brevi were confirmed and certain salutary regulations appended to them. It obtained the appellation of 'the synod of Victory,' perhaps from its having completed the final victory over Pelagianism in Britain.

The standard and rule of the British church.

We are informed by mediæval writers, that the acts of these synods *being confirmed by the Roman See*, became the standard and rule by which the British church was subsequently governed; and that St. David himself wrote them out with his own hand. Ricemarchus, Bishop of Menevia in the eleventh century, wrote the Life of St. David contained in the volume of Cambro-British Saints; fragments of which are also given by Wharton in his Anglia Sacra. Ricemarchus says that he derived his materials from 'the most eminent writings of the country, and principally from St. David's own city.' He speaks of these synods as follows:—'Ex his igitur duabus synodis, omnes nostræ patriæ ecclesiæ modum et regulam Romanâ auctoritate acceperunt.'

T. ii. p. 645.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 143; 446.

Anglia Sacra, t. ii. Præf. p. xxv.

According to Wharton, it is from this work by Ricemarchus that all the subsequent lives of St. David have been taken, including that by Giraldus

Cambrensis, which contains the same statement, but enlarges the expression '*by Roman authority*' as follows:—'the Roman church also giving authority' to the synods 'and confirming them.' *Ecclesiâ quoque Romanâ auctoritatem adhibente et confirmante.* Ibid. p. 639.

The same Giraldus says that at this time 'the church of God flourished exceedingly in Cambria, and from day to day brought forth more fruit;' that monasteries were founded in many places, and that Christ was devoutly served by many congregations of the faithful. 'Father David,' he proceeds, 'as if set up on a high watch-tower, afforded to all a mirror and a pattern of life. He instructed those under him by word, and he instructed them by example; a most powerful preacher with his lips, but more so in his works. For to hearers he was teaching, to religious a model, to the needy life, to orphans protection, to widows support, to the fatherless a father, to monks a rule, to seculars a road; being made all things to all men that he might make gain of all things for God.' Ricemarchus styles him 'the head of all the British nation, and the honour of his country.' The British church under St. David.

The same author states that St. David lived to a great age, and that the day of his departure was revealed to him by an angel, not long before it arrived. When he heard the friendly voice he exclaimed with joyful soul, 'Now dismiss Thy servant, O Lord, in peace;' and he remained in the church, preaching and officiating till seized with his mortal sickness. At cock-crow on the morning of his The death of St. David.

death, says the same ancient narrative, the monastery was filled with choirs of angels; with celestial canticles and the sweetest fragrance; and at the hour of matins, whilst the brethren were singing the office, the Lord Jesus vouchsafed to show Himself to the holy father David, who, all exulting in spirit when he beheld Him, called out,—'Take me after Thee.' '"*Tolle me*," *inquit*, "*post te*."' With these words he gave back his life to God, and in company with Christ, attended by the Angelic host, he went up to the gates of heaven.

Its revelation to St. Kentigern.

Bolland. Act. SS. Vit. S. Kentig. 13 Jan. cap. v. n. 28.

In a far-off region, St. Kentigern, at the same moment, was absorbed in protracted prayer amidst his monks, who saw that his aspect had become radiant as an angel's. His prayer being ended, he burst into tears, and when those around him asked the cause, he remained for a while in silence; then he told them that holy David, 'the glory of Britain, the father of his country, had at that moment left the prison of the flesh, and entered the realms of heaven'; and, that not only a multitude of angels had conducted him to the joy of his Lord, but that he had seen how 'even our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, going forth to meet him at the gates of Paradise, had crowned him with glory and honour.'

The date of St. David's death.

Welsh Saints, p. 201.

Authorities are not agreed as to the precise year of St. David's death. Ussher, the Bollandist commentator, and others after them, have placed it as early as A.D. 544. Rice Rees says that it may be postponed to any year prior to A.D. 566; whilst the

eminent critic, Dr. Lanigan, thinks that 'we may with great probability suppose that the year was 589;' for which opinion he gives his reasons.

Hist. Eccl. Ireland, vol. i. p. 471.

The religious honours rendered to St. David after his decease were by no means confined to the country, or local church, of Britain. He was originally buried at Menevia, but, during the tenth century, even before the Saxon rule had given place to the Norman, his remains, or a considerable portion of them, were translated to Glastonbury with great solemnity, and it is recorded also, that a fearful plague which raged in England was stayed, through God's mercy, upon the application of St. David's relics, when those of other saints had proved inefficacious.

The religious honours he received.

Butler, March 1. Bolland. Act. SS. 1 Mart. De S. Dav. Comm. Præv. § ii. n. 17.

Bolland. Act. SS. Vit. S. Dav. 1 Mart. Appendix iii. n. 2.

For centuries after his decease, St. David's shrine at Menevia attracted votaries both from his own and from foreign countries. William the Conqueror, Henry II., and Edward I., with Eleanor, his queen, were amongst the number.

Rice Rees, Essays on the Welsh Saints, pp. 201, 202.

This pilgrimage, if twice performed, was considered as equivalent to one pilgrimage to Rome. Hence the ancient verse:—

Rice Rees, Essays on the Welsh Saints, pp. 201, 202; and *note*, p. 202.

> Roma semel quantum, dat bis Menevia tantum.

And again the old couplet:—

> Meneviam si bis, et Romam si semel, ibis,
> Merces æqua tibi redditur hic et ibi.

His feast was celebrated with a solemn office on the first day of March in the province of Canterbury, and his name was inscribed in several martyrologies.

Bolland. Act. SS. 1 Martii, Comment. Præv. § i. 9.

Evidence that the British church was Roman Catholic.

This remarkable veneration for the memory of St. David, the titular saint of Wales, and the glory of her church, which may be looked upon as identified with him during the sixth century and ever after, could not possibly have been thus extended to succeeding generations, and over Catholic countries, if either he or his people, or the neighbouring bishops with whom he was united in his lifetime, had been out of communion with Rome and the universal church.

Nor, in such case, would the Roman See have confirmed this religious veneration as due to him, which it did at the commencement of the twelfth century.[1] Nor, again, in such case, would his festival

[1] The apostate monk John Bale, who took a wife, and was made Anglican bishop in Ireland by King Edward VI., states that St. David 'was put into the catalogue of papistical gods by Pope Callixtus II.' The name of St. David, however, is not found on the Roman martyrology. But Pope Callixtus (A.D. 1119–24) formally sanctioned the public veneration which had previously been rendered to him, as is mentioned in the Bollandist Acta SS. (1 Martii, Com. Præv. § i. 9).

There are numerous instances of *ancient* saints whose names are not on the Roman martyrology, but who are locally venerated in public with the express sanction of the Holy See. Amongst the thirty-four patron saints of the Irish dioceses, without counting the title of the Immaculate Conception, there are only seven who are enrolled on the Roman martyrology, yet all of them are honoured in Ireland with mass and office, as doubles of the first class, with octave, by the explicit sanction of Rome. See the *Directorium, seu Ordo, &c. pro anno* 1869, *jussu P. Card. Cullen, Arch. Dub.*, p. xxv. Many similar examples might be adduced, both from Ireland and other countries, but only in the case of those who by ecclesiastical usage were venerated as saints for more than one hundred years previous to the constitution and declaration of Pope Urban VIII., bearing date

still be found on the Roman Catholic English calendar, where at the present day it is honoured as a double, with mass and office, throughout the country.

St. Theliau.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 92, &c.; 332, &c. Bolland. Act. SS. 9 Feb. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 242, &c. Wharton, Anglia Sacra, t. ii. pp. 662, &c.

St. Theliau, or Teilo, the great bishop and patron of the diocese of Llandaff, is described by his biographers as a worshipper of God from his infancy; of noble birth and noble mind, earnest in devotion, and abounding in works of mercy. 'He made nothing that was his to be his own, and he made that to be his own which was not his. For leaving no remnant to himself of what he possessed, he exchanged transitory goods for eternal.' And thus he persevered to the end. 'In infancy he was good, in youth he was better, in old age he was most excellent.' St. Dubricius was his early instructor in the Holy Scriptures, in the knowledge of which he made remarkable progress, and when he was appointed to instruct others, it is said that they derived greater benefit from his simple and catholic reasoning, than they could have done from any philosophical subtleties; 'for he walked by Him who is the Way, and was taught by Him who is Wisdom.' Subsequently he became a pupil of Paulinus, and a friend of St. David, to whom he was so intimately united by mutual affection and the grace of God, that in all things they were of one and the same mind.

Pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

In the company of St. David and St. Padarn, as has already been related, St. Theliau made the pilgrimage

the 13th of March, A.D. 1625, in which he so decrees. See *Præfatio generalis in Vitas SS. Bolland.* cap. iii. § vi. tom. i. Jan.

to Jerusalem, where the three were consecrated bishops; a circumstance which could not have occurred, or even have been asserted to have occurred by their ancient biographers, if the local British church had been regarded as at that time outwardly separated from the universal body.

Gift of tongues.

Each of the three Saints, although ignorant of the language of the people, addressed the assembled congregation at Jerusalem, and were understood by them, in like manner as the Apostles were understood by the mixed multitudes on the day of Pentecost. This passage in their history, as well as a similar event recorded in the Bollandist life of St. Cadoc, has been quoted by the very careful and very learned theologian, Pope Benedict XIV., in his great work on the canonization of Saints, amongst other recorded instances of the gift of tongues.

Act. SS. 24 Jan.

Lib. iii. c. xlviii. n. 9.

Welsh Saints, p. 197.

The Triads commemorate David, Theliau, and Padarn, as the three blessed visitors of the isle of Britain, 'because they went as guests to the houses of the noble, the plebeian, the native, and the stranger, without accepting either fee or reward, or victuals or drink; but what they did was to teach the faith in Christ to every one, without pay or thanks. Besides which, they gave to the poor and needy, gifts of their gold and silver, their raiment and provisions.'

St. Teilo appointed Bishop of Llandaff.

Under the patronage of St. Dubricius, St. Theliau is said to have instituted a college or monastery, called Bangor Deilo, at Llandaff. St. Dubricius had retained his original bishopric of Llandaff when ele-

vated to the archbishopric of Caerleon, and he is sometimes styled Archbishop of Llandaff owing to the circumstance of his having mostly resided there. When St. Dubricius afterwards resigned his pastoral charge, St. David, as has already been stated, succeeded to the metropolitan see (which, at his request, was transferred to Menevia), and the bishopric of Llandaff was conferred upon St. Theliau.

The yellow sickness. Lib. Landav. pp. 101, &c.; 343, &c.

After St. Theliau had been entrusted with the pastoral charge of Llandaff, the whole country was nearly depopulated by a deadly sickness which was called the Yellow Plague, and which was said to have been seen visibly carried along throughout the country like a watery cloud, having one end trailing on the ground, and the other aloft in the air. It spared neither man nor beast, but brought death to all whom it touched with its pestilential breath. After earnest prayers and fastings, St. Theliau was admonished from on high, to leave Britain for a while with the residue of the people; some of them fled into Ireland, but many others, under the guidance of St. Theliau, passing through Cornwall, sailed over to the Continent, where they were cordially received by their compatriots of Brittany. St. Theliau was warmly welcomed by St. Sampson, with whom he resided for some time. A portion of these British refugees crossed the Alps into Italy, others remained in France, till the plague, by God's mercy, having ceased in Britain, the messengers of St. Theliau summoned all who had followed him from thence, to return with

him again to their own country. There was weeping and mourning amongst the people of Brittany, when St. Theliau prepared to leave them ; but at length he departed, accompanied by other bishops and clergy, and by his nephew, St. Oudoceus, who afterwards succeeded him in the bishopric of Llandaff.

St. Teilo made Archbishop of Menevia.

Upon the arrival of St. Theliau in Britain after this absence, which is said to have lasted for seven years and seven months, he was elected to the archbishopric of Menevia, then vacant through the death of Archbishop Cynog, the successor of St. David in that see. But St. Theliau appears to have exercised the metropolitan rule from his residence at Llandaff, of which, like his predecessor, he was styled the Archbishop ; and he deputed the administration of the diocese of Menevia to his nephew Ismael, whom he consecrated Bishop. It was partly on this ground that, after his decease, the see of Llandaff so strongly asserted a claim to the primacy over all the other bishoprics in Wales.

Date of his decease.

The date of the decease of St. Theliau is uncertain, but it has been seen that he survived St. David, and, according to the English martyrology, he was alive when St. Augustine arrived in England, A.D. 596-7. Fr. Bollandus, however, thinks it more probable that he died shortly before the year 560. Alban Butler says that his death occurred about the year 580. It is impossible, as has before been observed, to arrive with any certainty or precision at the dates of events during this period of British history.

Lives of Saints, Feb. 9.

The ancient register of the cathedral church of Llandaff, commonly called 'the Book of Llandaff,' *Liber Landavensis*, bears also the title of *Llyfr Teilo*, or 'the book of Theliau,' so closely is he identified with the history of that see.

Llyfr Teilo, or Liber Landavensis.

Amongst other ancient and important documents, this register contains 'the privilege of St. Teilo and his church of Llandaff,' which is stated to have been granted by Kings and Princes, and 'confirmed by apostolic authority.' After enumerating several immunities, the writing declares that, 'it is ordained by apostolic authority, *statutum est enim apostolicâ auctoritate*,' as the privilege of that church, to be free from every burden of secular service; and that 'it shall enjoy validly and entirely whatever by the concession of Pontiffs, the liberality of princes, the offerings of the faithful, or other just means may belong to it.' Subsequently it is stated in Welsh, according to the translation of Mr. W. Rees,—'This is the law and privilege of the church of Teilo, of Llandaff, which these Kings and Princes of Wales granted to the church of Teilo, and to all its Bishops after him for ever; and was confirmed by the Popes of Rome, &c., &c.'

Roman authority.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 111, &c.; 355, &c.

Ibid. p. 356.

Finally, appended to this document there is a note, which Mr. Rees says 'appears in the original text to have been added by a much later hand, in which it is recorded that 'the great sentence of excommunication of St. Teilo, *which he obtained in the court of Rome*, against the invaders of the liber-

Ibid. pp. 114; 358.

ties and privileges of the Cathedral Church of Llandaff, was read and proclaimed in the usual manner, on his day, in the year 1410 of the Lord's incarnation. And,' it proceeds, 'within the short space of seven days afterwards, transgressors of the same, being vexed by the instigation of the devil, fell furiously mad, and continued so for the rest of their lives.'

St. Oudoceus.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 123, &c.; 370, &c. Bolland. Act. SS. 2 Jul. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 251, &c.; 274. Butler's Lives, July 2.

St. Oudoceus, who succeeded St. Teilo in the see of Llandaff, was the third son of St. Teilo's sister Anaumed, the wife of the Armorican prince Budic, who, having been expelled from Brittany, had taken refuge in Wales, and there married. Their two elder sons were Ismael and Tyfei. The former, as has been already mentioned, was consecrated bishop by St. Theliau, and entrusted by him with the administration of the church of Menevia. The latter was killed when a child, and was popularly accounted as a martyr, having come between a swineherd and an angry rich man, who was endeavouring to smite the swineherd with a lance, because the said swineherd's pigs had done damage to his corn. The swineherd defended himself, and the rich man ran his spear through the child.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 120; 366.

Budic was afterwards recalled to Armorica, to which having returned with his wife and all his household, he established his dominion over the whole of the country. Soon after his return, his wife gave birth to St. Oudoceus, who was dedicated by his parents to God's service, as both his elder

brothers had been, and was brought up accordingly from his childhood.

When St. Theliau led his people into Brittany, to escape from the yellow pestilence, 'he there found his nephew Oudoceus, a man illustrious and meek, skilled in both laws' (the Old and New Testaments), shining 'as a candle on a candlestick.' St. Oudoceus, as has been mentioned above, afterwards accompanied St. Theliau on his return into his own country; and 'he so greatly increased in goodness and knowledge,' that, upon the decease of his uncle, he was elected to succeed him in the see of Llandaff.

Lib. Landav. pp. 124; 372.

It is stated in the 'Book of Llandaff' that St. Oudoceus was sent, attended by a numerous suite, to 'the city of Canterbury to the blessed Archbishop' (Augustine), 'where he was consecrated Bishop of the Church of Llandaff.' The same document subsequently recounts how St. Oudoceus was received with joy at Llandaff by the King and all the magnates, and how they went round in solemn procession, 'the King holding the four Gospels in his hand,' and 'the holy cross preceding;' and how holy water was sprinkled on all the boundary, and the privileges formerly conferred upon that church were confirmed, and amongst them it is stated that, 'as the Roman Church surpasses the dignity of all the churches of the Catholic faith, so that Church of Llandaff surpasses all the churches of dextral Britain (*dextralis Britanniæ*) in dignity and in privilege and in excellence.'

The privileges of Llandaff.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 124, 125; 372, 373.

Claims in behalf of Llandaff. Liber Landavensis, pp. 83, 84; 555, 556; and Wharton, Ang. Sacra, t. ii. p. 673.

The same pre-eminence was claimed for this see by Urban, Bishop of Llandaff, who appealed to the handwriting of St. Theliau as testimony, in the requisition which he presented to Pope Callixtus II. at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 1119. He further asserted therein that, in spite of seditions, and wars, and the cruelty of the natives, and the invasion of the Normans, there were always religious men who clove to and served in the Church of Llandaff, 'both on account of the vicinity of the English (from whom, indeed, they differed nothing in ecclesiastical ministry, because they had been brought up and educated amongst them), and also because from ancient times, that is, from the time of Eleutherius, Pope of the Roman See, and after the coming of Augustine, Metropolitan of the Church of Canterbury, into the island of Britain, the bishop of that place' (Llandaff) 'had always been subject, and in all things obedient, to the archbishop of the same' (Canterbury), 'as well as to the King of the English.'

Character of Bishop Urban.

It was at that time the policy of the English government to fill the Welsh sees with men who were favourable to English interests, and it may be gathered from the above extract that this good Bishop Urban was not wanting in that qualification. At the same time he was renowned for wisdom, and munificent liberality, as well as for zeal in his diocese of whose present cathedral he was the founder. He was famed as a peacemaker, and was a vigorous suppressor of vicious practices. The valuable compila-

Liber Landavensis, p. 553, *notes.*

tion of ancient documents and local traditions, entitled, 'The Book of Llandaff,' is supposed to have been the work of a brother of the same Bishop Urban.

Evidence to be deduced from the above statement.

It may be that the devoted ardour of these two brothers in the interests of their Church of Llandaff, together with their English sympathies, betrayed them into too easy credence of the improbable assertions which have been quoted, respecting the consecration of St. Oudoceus by St. Augustine, and the ancient subjection of the Bishop of Llandaff to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the English King. But, be this as it may, it is sufficient for the present purpose to observe that such assertions could never have been made, if it had been supposed at the time, that, at the period to which they referred, the See of Llandaff was cut off from visible communion with the Church of Rome. And, further, if Llandaff had been looked upon as a favourable exception, and it had been thought that other British dioceses were cut off from communion with Rome at the period in question, it may reasonably be conjectured that Bishop Urban would not have failed to urge upon the Pope, a circumstance so calculated to place his own diocese in honourable contrast to its neighbours, over whom he claimed for it the precedence. Therefore, whatever opinion may be entertained of the historical credibility of these statements in themselves, the very fact of their being thus publicly put forward in the twelfth century, is an unquestionable evidence of the belief of that age in the uninterrupted

visible communion of the British Church in general, with Rome and with Christendom at large.

St. Oudoceus visited Rome.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 127; 376.

The same 'Book of Llandaff,' with greater appearance of probability, mentions a visit of St. Oudoceus to the threshold of St. Peter. *Sanctus Oudoceus post tempus suæ maturitatis, visitatis ab eo liminibus Sancti Petri, &c. &c.*

His meekness.

The virtue of meekness adorned St. Oudoceus from his youth. When St. Theliau went over to Brittany he found him, as has been said, 'an illustrious and a meek man,' *virum præclarum et mansuetum.* Nor did he manifest this great virtue less when further advanced in years.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 128, 129; 377, 378.

It is related that on one occasion, 'as he was travelling through his diocese, towards his church at Llandaff, his attendants reverently carrying the relics and singing psalms with praises, and the holy cross going before,' he and his company were attacked 'with great fury by persons full of envy and covetousness' who had ill-will against him, and who came out of the rocks and endeavoured to seize upon the sacred treasures. But their wicked intentions were frustrated by a divine judgment, which smote them with blindness and paralysis. St. Oudoceus fell upon his knees imploring God's mercy for the offenders, who on their part asked for pardon and acknowledged their guilt. At the prayers of the saint they recovered their sight and the use of their limbs, and they promised to do penance and to amend their lives.

King Enion's chase.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 129, 130; 379.

The very animals fearlessly confided in the mercy and power of St. Oudoceus. One day the rocks and woods on the banks of the river Wye resounded with the clang of horns, and the cry of hounds and huntsmen. King Enion was pursuing over the hills and along the valleys a stag, whose perseverance, together with the course which it selected, excited his wonder and admiration. At length the wearied beast came near a spot where St. Oudoceus then was serving God, and, with a bound, it gained his cloak. 'There lying down, it reposed, panting and secure (*ibi jacens requievit, anhelans et tutus*) like one escaped from shipwreck, or whose sorrow was turned to joy.' The hounds, stopping short, stood mute and stupified, and the king and huntsmen 'fell upon their knees, lifting up their hands to Heaven, and earnestly asking pardon of the Lord and of St. Oudoceus, as if they had been guilty of a crime.'

His grant of land.

Ibid.

The king first claimed for himself 'the quiet and peaceful stag,' and then 'he gave all the territory which he had gone round during the whole day, following the track of the stag, to God, and to St. Dubricius, St. Teilo, and St. Oudoceus the Bishop, and to all the Bishops of Llandaff for ever; the aforesaid track over mountains, brooks, and rocks, dividing for ever the territories of the church.'

St. Oudoceus there builds an oratory.

Lib. Landav. pp. 130, 131; 380.

The region thus bestowed upon the church is described as abounding in fish, honey, and solitude, *locum piscosum et mellifluum et solitarium.* Here St. Oudoceus built an oratory, and here, having

He retires to a monastic life.

resigned his pastoral charge and called to him his brethren, he led a monastic life for many years, *vitam sanctam*, *vitam claram*, *vitam de die in diem melioratam*. Multitudes flocked to him for counsel and for comfort, and all who came were strengthened by his 'paternal assistance,' and consoled by his 'gentle and grave advice.'

The Rome of Britain.

Separated from the extreme south-western promontory of Carnarvonshire by a rushing race of the ocean waves, is found the little isle of Bardsey, called in the Welsh tongue,—Ynys Enlli. Frequent mention of this island occurs in the histories of the early British saints. It was accounted the most hallowed spot in Cambria, and fabulous stories were narrated by ancient simplicity, of the privileges with which it was endowed by nature, and by the special gifts of Divine Providence.

Liber Landavensis, pp. 3, 4; 80; 282; 328.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 281; 616.

Here St. Dubricius retired in his old age, to prepare for death; and here, in watchings, fastings, and prayers, he led the life of a hermit till he died. Here was he buried, and here his sacred body rested till translated to the cathedral of Llandaff, by Bishop Urban, A.D. 1120. Here, also, till the so-called Reformation, the monks of a very ancient abbey continued the strains of praise to God above, and the labours of love to man below, commenced on the same island in the early days of Britain.

It is a notable sign of the affection of the ancient Britons for the church and city most dear to every

Catholic heart, that, from the earliest times, it was their custom to designate this venerated abode of saints as—'The Rome of Britain,'—'on account,' says the Llandaff register, 'of its distance, being situated at the extremity of the kingdom, and the dangerous passage to it by sea; and also on account of the sanctity and beauty of the place; sanctity, since twenty thousand bodies of saints, confessors as well as martyrs, lie there; beauty, since it is everywhere surrounded by the sea, having on the east side a lofty promontory, and on the west a fertile plain, with a sweetly flowing spring of water; and part of it on the sea-shore, and abounding with dolphins; it is altogether free from serpents and from frogs, and the younger amongst brethren who dwell there together, is never seized by death, so long as his elder brother continues in this life.' This island was the terrestrial paradise, and the holy ground of the ancient Britons; it was their ante-chamber to the paradise on high; and they knew no name which comprised all this so fully, and which expressed it half so well, as that name of sweetness and of never-ending power to stir men's hearts, the glorious name of—ROME![1]

[1] This may be a fitting opportunity to speak of a certain couplet, which is occasionally produced in evidence by writers who endeavour to maintain that the early British church was at enmity with the Roman See. It contains a denunciation of woe upon pastors who do not protect their flocks from 'the Roman wolves,' *o bleiddi rufeniaid.* It is quoted as the composition of an ancient British bard, and sometimes it is even attributed to St. Cadoc (*Cattawg*). Although the only passage of the kind

St. Kentigern. Bolland. Act. SS. 13 Jan.

Though it is very probable that St. Kentigern, known also as St. Mungo, belonged by birth to the Picts or to the Scots, yet he was so intimately connected with the British church during the sixth century, that he must also be regarded as amongst the British Saints. He was consecrated Bishop of Glasgow, but

which I have met with, I did not wish to pass it by unnoticed. I therefore asked the favour of information respecting it from the eminent bardic scholar, Mons. le Vicomte de la Villemarqué, Member of the French Institute; whose valuable and interesting works have already been so largely quoted. In a very courteous and obliging reply he informed me, that, several years ago, he was consulted on the same subject by the well-known historian Mons. Augustin Thierry, in preparation for the last edition of Mons. A. Thierry's *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*; and that, after the investigation which he then undertook, he arrived at the conclusion—First, that the passage in question is not authentic; and that it cannot be of earlier date than the twelfth century. (The visible communion of the Welsh church with Rome at that period will hardly be disputed.) Secondly, that it is extremely doubtful whether the British word *rufeniaid*, which means *Roman*, is the correct reading; and probably the word *rhibiniaid*, meaning *rapaces*, or ravening (corresponding to the 'ravening wolves' against whom Christ warns us in the gospel), should be substituted in its place. The said word (*rhibiniaid*, or *ravening*) is given as a various reading to the passage in the Myvyrian archaiology (vol. 1). In the earlier editions of his celebrated work above referred to, Mons. Aug. Thierry expressly quoted this very protestant denunciation, with the following reference:—'Cattawg, Horæ Britannicæ, t. II. p. 277.' But in the last and corrected edition of the same book (Paris, Furne et Cie., 1859), amongst many other amendments, he has omitted all mention of it, thus adopting the conclusion of Mons. de la Villemarqué. It is evident, therefore, that the passage in question can no longer serve as the basis of any argument, being rejected by historical and antiquarian authorities of such high and established and universal reputation.

having been compelled by a wicked conspiracy to fly from his diocese, he took refuge in Wales, where he visited St. David at Menevia. He distinguished himself by his apostolic labours in Wales, and he ultimately founded the monastery and bishopric of Llan-elwy, in Flintshire, better known to posterity under the name of his disciple and successor, St. Asaph.

Deficiencies in the orders of St. Kentigern.

In the ancient Life of St. Kentigern, published by the Bollandists from the collection of Capgrave as anonymous, but referred to by Fr. Alford in his annals as written by John of Tinmouth, it is stated, that, this 'man of God went seven times to Rome, and unfolded in order, to St. Gregory, the spiritual Apostle of the Angles, all his life, election, and consecration, and all the events which had befallen him. But the holy Pope perceiving him to be a man of God, and full of the grace of the Holy Ghost, confirmed his consecration, which he knew to have come from God; and, supplying those things which were deficient in his consecration, he' (Kentigern) 'having very often sought it, and with difficulty obtained it (*multotiens petente, et vix impetrante*), he appointed him to the work of the ministry enjoined him by the Holy Ghost.'

T. ii. p. 47, an. 539.

Vita in Boll. Act. SS. cap. v. § 29.

They were not essential.

It is evident that if the Pope had considered the deficiencies in question to have been of essential moment, instead of thus hesitating about supplying them, he would have insisted on it as necessary.

Their nature.

The nature of these deficiencies may be gathered

Vita, cap. iii. §§ 13, 14.

from a previous chapter in the same Life, where it is stated that St. Kentigern was consecrated Bishop in his twenty-fifth year, which was before the canonical age; and where it also appears that he was consecrated by one Bishop only, who was sent for from Ireland, and, 'after the manner of the Britons and the Scots.' 'For,' says the ancient writer, 'a custom had grown up in Britain, in the consecration of Bishops, only to anoint their heads with the infusion of the sacred chrism, with invocation of the Holy Ghost, and benediction, and imposition of the hand. For, being islanders, situated as it were outside the world, and harassed by the assaults of the pagans, they did not know the canons. Therefore ecclesiastical censure condescending to them, holds them excused in this respect.'

Similar deficiencies were frequent in Britain.

These considerations must be equally pleaded to account for and excuse their ignorance respecting the proper computation of the period of the Paschal feast, and respecting other matters of discipline as to which their customs were at variance with those of the Catholic church in general.

St. Kentigern recalled.

Vita, cap. vi.

The enemies of St. Kentigern being dead, King Rederech, who then reigned over the Britons of Strath-Clyde, and who had at heart the spiritual welfare of his people and the propagation of the true faith, earnestly solicited the holy bishop to come back to his own diocese of Glasgow. The Saint obeyed the call; he returned with a large

company of monks, and many and great were the wonders which he wrought. He gave sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf, he made the dumb to speak and the lame to walk, he cleansed the lepers and he cast out devils, he restored movement and vigour to the palsied, and he healed all kinds of sickness. He brought unbelievers to the faith, and sinners to repentance; he founded monasteries and erected churches; and he sent forth his disciples as missionaries to the Orkneys, to Norway, and even to the distant Iceland.

His dying admonitions. Vita, cap. vii. § 42.

At length, when in a good old age, the hour drew near for his departure to a better country, this venerable servant of Christ, 'having called together his disciples, earnestly exhorted them as to the observance of holy religion, of mutual charity, of peace, of hospitality, of reading, and of prayer. He gave,' continues the writer, 'and left behind him, strong precepts concerning the decrees of the holy fathers, and the institutes of the holy Roman church, which were firmly to be adhered to.'

Thus is St. Kentigern depicted by this ancient biographer, as a faithful and zealous child of the apostolic see of Rome. Besides the importance of the fact in reference to the history of the British church, it lends an additional interest to the meeting between himself and St. Columba, who was so confidently appealed to by the Scots as an authority in the Paschal controversy.

The fame of the holy Bishop of Glasgow had

The visit of St. Columba.

Vita S. Kentig. cap. vii. §§ 38, 39. in Bolland. Act. SS. 13 Jan.

reached the ears of the great Abbot of Iona, and he longed to go to him, to visit, and to see him, and to become familiar with him as a friend. He journeyed forth for the purpose from his monastery accompanied by a large number of his disciples, and when he arrived near the abode of St. Kentigern he divided them into three bands. The Bishop came out to meet him, preceded by a similar procession. 'In the first band were the young men, in the second the middle-aged, in the third the elders, venerable with their comely locks of white.' On both sides arose the chant of psalms and holy canticles, and the air resounded with the joyful Alleluia. 'And St. Columba said to his disciples; "I behold a column of fire, in the form of a golden crown descending upon the holy bishop in the third company, and the light of celestial brightness over him." And when the Saints drew near together, they rushed into each other's arms, and embraced with holy kisses.' *Et appropinquantes ad invicem Sancti in amplexus mutuos et oscula sancta ruunt.* In sign of mutual affection they interchanged their staffs, and, according to the same writer, 'the staff which St. Columba gave to the Bishop was for a long time held in great veneration at *Ripus*, in the church of St. Wlferus.' Fr. Bollandus seems to think this may mean Ripon, where, in the century after St. Columba, was the monastery of St. Wilfrid, the strenuous opponent of the ecclesiastical peculiarities of the Celts in his own day, but the willing

Ubi supra, not. d.

S. Bed. Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. c. 25.

excuser of their ancestors, who were ignorant of the more correct customs.

The title of Munghu or Mongho, meaning, says Butler, 'one dearly beloved,' was applied to St. Kentigern from his youth; and the old cathedral church of Glasgow is still called after him,—St. Mungo.

Lives of the Saints, Jan. 13.

So dear was he to his disciples, that, when he was dying, certain of them earnestly besought him to obtain from God that they might accompany him to the realms above. 'It seems to us unbecoming,' they expostulated, 'that a Bishop without clergy, a Pastor without any of his flock, a Father without sons should enter into the joys of his Lord.' It is related that their prayer was heard, and that, 'together with the holy father they migrated to the heavenly mansions.'

Affection inspired by St. Kentigern.

Bolland. Act. SS. 13 Jan. Vita S. Kentig. cap. vii. §§ 42, 43.

Butler gives the year 601, as the date of the death of St. Kentigern, but according to Father Bollandus, it is placed in the English martyrology as late as A.D. 608. It was between these two periods, perhaps in the year 604, that St. Augustine of Canterbury was also taken to his reward.

Date of his death

Lives of the Saints, Jan. 13. Bolland. Acta SS. 13 Jan. De S. Kentig. § 7.

When St. Kentigern was recalled from Wales, he obtained that his favourite disciple Asaph should succeed him in the bishopric, and in the rule of the monastery which he had founded; having been admonished to do so, says his Life, by an angelic communication.

St. Asaph.

Vita S. Kentig. c. vi. § 32.

St. Asaph is described as illustrious in birth and in appearance, as consecrated to God and con-

Bolland. Act. SS. 1 Mai.

spicuous for virtues and for miracles from his youth, and it is related that, whilst yet in the enjoyment of youth's full flower and freshness in mind and in body, he left parents, patrimony, and all that he possessed, freely, lovingly, and piously bestowing his wealth on the poor, the widowed, the sick, the blind, and the lame, and made it the study of his life to walk in the footsteps of Christ and His saints. St. Kentigern was his guide and his master in the school of religious perfection, and the young Asaph used his utmost endeavours to conform himself to his preceptor's mode of life 'in all sanctity and abstinence.'

The miracle of the fire.

According to a penitential practice not unusual in that age, St. Kentigern was in the habit of remaining immersed in cold water, whilst he recited the Psalter. On one occasion, whilst so doing, he became almost paralysed with the cold, and he told young Asaph to bring him fire to restore warmth to his frozen limbs. The youth hastened to fulfil the errand, but, when the fire was found, he had no vessel in which to carry it. His fervent zeal brooked no delay; he seized at once upon the redhot embers, and gathering them up into his bosom, he hurried back without further thought, to his beloved and suffering master. At St. Kentigern's bidding, Asaph threw them on the ground, and no trace of burning was to be found either on the person or on the garments of the holy acolyte.

Lives of the Saints, May 1.

Butler says that St. Asaph was a diligent preacher,

and the author of certain canons or ordinances of his church, also of a life of St. Kentigern and some other works, and that he died about the close of the sixth century. But according to the Bollandist Father, Henschenius, his death did not occur till the seventh century. He may therefore have been alive at the period of the celebrated conference of the British Bishops with St. Augustine. In any case, he appears to have been his contemporary.

Act. SS. 1 Maii.

Reciprocal honours paid to British and Saxon saints.

St. Asaph and St. Walburge.

This renders it more especially worthy of note, that, in the Roman martyrology, the British Bishop, St. Asaph, is commemorated on the same day and in the same sentence as the Saxon Princess St. Walburge. The first of May is therein mentioned as their feast day, as follows :—'In England' (the feast) 'of the Saints Asaph Bishop, and Walburge Virgin.' *In Anglia Sanctorum Asaphi Episcopi, et Walburgæ Virginis.*

Thus visibly does the unity of God's church supersede all national feuds, and mere local and superficial differences!

Nor are similar instances wholly wanting on the part of the British.

St. Mellitus.

One of the ancient 'Pedigrees of Welsh Saints' contains the name of St. Mellitus; who, having been consecrated Bishop of London by St. Augustine, afterwards succeeded St. Lawrence as the third Archbishop of Canterbury. He is thus commemorated in the old Welsh manuscript :—'Melyd, Bishop of London, was from the country of Rome.'

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 270; 599.

Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, p. 322.

St. Oswald, King. Butler, Lives of the Saints, Aug. 5.

There were also churches in Wales which were dedicated to Anglo-Saxon Saints; the earliest in date of those so honoured was St. Oswald, King of Northumbria, who was slain in battle against the heathen Mercian King, Penda, A.D. 642, and is commemorated in the Roman martyrology, on the 5th of August. He must be accounted, however, as belonging to the Celtic party, since he had been baptized and instructed amongst the Scots or Picts, and was the special friend of St. Aidan.

St. Milburge.

Butler, Feb. 23.

The same honour was paid to St. Milburge, who was of the royal house of Mercia, being granddaughter to the above-named Penda. She was Abbess of Wenlock, in Shropshire, and Butler says that she rendered her convent 'a true paradise of all virtue.' She died there towards the close of the seventh century, exhorting her community to 'the love of purity of heart and holy peace.' She is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 23rd of February. Mr. Rice Rees mentions the church of Llanfilo in Brecknockshire, as having been dedicated under her patronage.

St. Beuno.

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 13, &c.; 299, &c. Butler's Lives, April 21. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints.

The British Saint Beuno or Beino, though born in the sixth century, belongs more prominently to the first part of the seventh. His parents were virtuous and pious and of noble blood. His father was brother to St. Cadoc, and his mother was aunt to St. Kentigern. St. Beuno was their only son, and they were advanced in years when he was given to them. They were themselves his first instructors,

but they afterwards placed him under the care of a teacher called Tangusius, at Caerwent; 'and with that Saint, with the assistance of God, he obtained a knowledge of all the Holy Scriptures; afterwards, he learned the service and the rules of the church, and took orders, and became a clergyman.'

In the life of St. Winefride, published by Surius, who attributes its authorship to Robert, Abbot of Glastonbury in the year 1140, St. Beuno is described as 'a most holy man, illustrious for many virtues,' who, 'having despised his father's throne, had fled away in poverty, and, having become a monk, in a short time attained perfection.' De probat. SS. Vitis, Nov. 3.

Very few particulars of his history have been preserved, but his active zeal for religion, and his high reputation for sanctity, are made manifest by the many monastic institutions of which he was the founder and the father, and by the number of ancient churches which were dedicated under his name.

Clynnog Fawr.

In the year 616 he founded the monastery of Clynnog Fawr, where he afterwards died and was buried, and where his tomb was held in especial veneration through all subsequent ages till the dark days of desecration, miscalled Reformation. During the middle ages this monastery passed into the possession of the Benedictine monks of Cluni, and hence the name of Clynnog became attached to the village, the adjective Fawr (meaning *great*) being added to distinguish it from Little Clynnog. But the beautiful monastic parish church still bears the name of St.

St. Beuno's ancient church.

Beuno, in whose honour it was originally dedicated. The present building is considered to date from the reign either of King Edward IV., or King Henry VII. It is of Gothic architecture, and spacious in its dimensions. Near the west end of the church, and connected with it by a short narrow passage on the south side, is the chapel called especially St. Beuno's, and sometimes 'the church of the grave;' because, till about ninety years ago, it contained the once venerated tomb of St. Beuno. The church has been recently restored, but the chapel of St. Beuno is falling into decay, and the old oaken box, formerly replete with the offerings of the faithful, whose massive strength gave rise to the proverb,—'You may as well try to break St. Beuno's chest;' is now a mere antiquarian relic; a curiosity of the vestry-room; empty and devoid of the many gifts which in mediæval times the piety of rich and poor consigned to its safe keeping, for the services of the now forsaken and dilapidated shrine. Such was the devotion rendered to this British Saint when the Roman creed prevailed. Such is the cold neglect which now attends his memory when Anglicanism has usurped its place!

Which of the two would the British Beuno own, if, at this moment, he were to arise from the dust?

Near the churchyard, whose large and ancient trees half conceal the neighbouring village; on the wayside, but protected by a wall, is found St. Beuno's holy well; a never-failing source of purest

water; like the heavenly grace diffused upon St. Beuno's lips. The people still flock to the well for water, but they have ceased to ask the saint to obtain for them the graces they require from heaven.

Everything in that mountain village[1] tells of a devotion which has passed away. When Wales and England were Roman Catholic, Beuno was known and venerated;—venerated at a period when no such veneration would be shown to any one, who had died in communion with a religious body which was visibly separated from Rome, and from the universal church. He is venerated now as before, in and by that church herself.

At Clynnog the Roman creed is set at nought, and Beuno's shrine is crumbling to decay.

St. Beuno's modern college.

If there be a body of men who hold dear that creed of Rome, it is the noble band which bears the high title of 'the Society of Jesus.' At their newly-founded college, on a hill-side overlooking the vale of Clwyd, that creed is the one rule and guide of those Reverend Fathers and their disciples; and holy men go forth from thence to spread it far and near throughout the earth. Here St. Beuno still is honoured. The Jesuit Fathers have placed their

[1] For the local particulars I have given respecting Clynnog Fawr and its church and holy well, I am indebted to the courtesy of the present incumbent; who further informs me that he is not aware of the actual continuance of any of the pious practices in honour of St. Beuno, which Butler says still survived in the neighbourhood of Clynnog, at the period when he wrote. See Butler's life of St. Beuno, April 21.

college under his patronage, and they have called it by his name.

St. Beuno's virtues.

Shall it then be said that Beuno died visibly apart from the communion and the arms of that Roman and universal church, which, ever a true mother, through long ages has recognised him as her own, and honoured him as a saint in heaven; which recognises him still as such, and as such invokes him, where in the realms of bliss he reigns with Christ, her only Spouse and Lord?

Camb.-Brit. Saints, p. 307.

'No one knows,' says the old Welsh Life, after telling of his miracles, 'no one knows what God did to Beuno, but God Himself. And it is manifest that whosoever does good, God will be his assistant; all that God commanded, Beuno performed; meat and drink he gave to all whom he saw that were hungry and thirsty, clothing he gave to the naked, and lodging to strangers; he visited the sick, conferred benefits on prisoners, and whatever the Holy Scriptures ordered to be done, he performed.'

In the days of St. Beuno occurred the barbarous massacre, said to have been foretold by St. Augustine of Canterbury, of the monks of Bangor-ys-Coed, in Flintshire, at the command of the heathen Saxon king Ethelfrid, because they were assembled on the field of battle to pray against his success. If it be true that St. Beuno entertained the intense national antipathy towards the whole Saxon race, which is attributed to him in a portion of his ancient Life already quoted, his personal acquaintance with this

See above, pp. 295, 296.

massacre will assist to explain it. But Catholic unity is everlasting, whilst nationality is a thing of time. However strong may have been the aversion of the British Beuno when on earth, to the English invaders of his country, English churchmen after his decease, have enrolled him on their martyrology, and have invoked the assistance of his intercession before the throne of God.

Acta SS. 14 Jan. inter SS. in alios dies rejectos.

Father Bollandus mentions St. Beuno as commemorated both in the English and in other martyrologies; including the general catalogue, by Ferrarius, of those saints who are not expressly named in the Roman martyrology.

St. Winefride.

Butler, Lives of the Saints, Nov. 3. Surius, De probatis SS. Vitis, Vita S. Wenefridæ V. M. Nov. 3.

The history of the Holy Virgin and Martyr, St. Winefride, is closely connected with that of St. Beuno, who is said to have been her uncle on the mother's side. She was the only child of parents whose lives and actions were animated by a true Christian spirit, and who made it their earnest care to preserve her untainted from the world, and to bring her up in the fear and the love of God. Her father was one of the highest nobles in the country, and very wealthy. He bestowed on St. Beuno land on which to build a church, and he committed the youthful Winefride to his spiritual guidance and instruction. Whilst the saint preached to the people, the young maiden was wont to be seated at his feet, eagerly listening to his words and meditating on them in her heart.

Those words produced abundant fruit in the generous soul of Winefride, who, inflamed with heavenly

love, entreated St. Beuno to obtain the consent of her parents that she should dedicate herself wholly 'a chaste virgin to Christ,' as her only Spouse. They received the proposal with tears of joy, blessing and praising God, to Whom they gladly and heartily gave her. The holy virgin still would sit at the feet of the man of God, her whole soul absorbed in his description of the glory of her celestial bridegroom. She would urge him to speak of the life and the manners of her immortal Spouse, till, lost in love and admiration of His excellence, beauty, and majesty, her heart and mind had no room for the thought of any earthly delights, but were filled with never-failing matter for divine contemplation and for spiritual joy. Frequently would she watch by night in the church, and diligently she cherished the flame of divine love. Tender in years, but advanced in truest wisdom, she utterly contemned all base desires; and in spirit, as well as in body, she faithfully observed the vow of perpetual virginity which she had privately taken at the hands of her uncle, the holy Beuno.

2 Cor. xi. 2.

Her martyrdom.

The marvellous history of her martyrdom and subsequent restoration to life, is well known: how the young prince Caradoc became enamoured of her beauty; how he found her alone in her father's house; how, flying in haste from his importunity, she endeavoured to gain the church, where her parents had gone to assist at mass and to hear St. Beuno preach; how Caradoc followed, and overtook

her on the way; and how, when she told him that she was wedded to the King Eternal who was to judge the living and the dead, and that she would admit no other spouse, in a paroxysm of rage with his sword he struck off her head; how St. Beuno, moved by holy indignation, asked of God to treat the murderer as he deserved; how at the word the miserable wretch suddenly fell to the ground and expired; how his body disappeared—'many,' says the old writer, 'affirming that, together with his soul, it went down to hell'; how, at St. Beuno's prayers, young Winefride was restored to life, a white circlet, like a thread, remaining round her neck, and serving as a memorial of its former severance from her body; finally, how she survived for many years, and then died peaceably in her convent. Scoffers have scoffed at this ancient legend, and scoffers will continue to scoff at it; but such was the tradition recorded from the olden time. The whole church of God still honours St. Winefride as a martyr, which title, as well as that of virgin, is accorded to her in all the calendars and martyrologies. It is said that, from the white circle round her neck, she obtained the name of Winefride, having previously been called Brenna. Win was the British word for white.

Her resuscitation.

On the spot where the body of the martyred virgin fell, there sprang up, it is said, that copious flow of healing waters still so frequented at Holywell, in Flintshire, the red-streaked pebbles of whose bed

St. Winefride's Well.

and banks, commemorate the chaste blood which she poured forth freely from her veins, rather than prove unfaithful to her heavenly Lord and Spouse: whilst the sweetly-scented moss, which clusters round them, records the odour of her sanctity and purity, and the fragrance of the holocaust which she so gladly offered, consumed with the love of Christ. Numerous miracles, whose authenticity is established beyond a question, have been wrought by God at the intercession of St. Winefride, by means of those abundant waters, and of the fragrant moss which grows upon their brink.

She takes the veil.

It was not until after this event, that St. Winefride publicly took upon herself the vows of a religious life, and, having received the veil from St. Beuno, departed from her father's house. She then, together with several other pious virgins of noble birth, began to occupy an abode near Holywell, which, with all its furniture and all that the people had bestowed upon him, was given up by St. Beuno for the purpose, and was thus converted into the convent of these holy women, under the direction of St. Winefride. St. Beuno removed elsewhere, taking with him nothing but his staff. He returned, according to Butler, to Clynnog Fawr, where he subsequently died.

After his death, 'admonished,' says her ancient Life, 'by God,' St. Winefride sought counsel from St. Deifer and St. Saturnus, from whom she learnt it to be the Divine pleasure that she should pass the rest of

her days under the holy abbot Elerius, in his double monastery of monks and nuns, at Gwytherin in Denbighshire, about five miles from Llanrwst. St. Elerius, supernaturally informed of her approach, went forth to meet her, and having received her with honour, he brought her to the convent of the Virgins, and requested her to undertake the charge of it, 'Here,' says the same old Life, 'whoever came to her in sickness, went away from her in health; all who, oppressed with grief drew near to her, carried back with them joy of heart.'

In another ancient biography, it is said of her :— 'It is not in our power to express how this virgin excelled in the eloquence of knowledge, for the sentences she spoke were accounted sweeter than honey, and smoother than milk (*melle dulciores, lacteque nitidiores*), in the minds of her hearers. So that, she was styled by all, without exception, the bright Winefride (*candida Wenefreda*), for she spoke with the brightness of wisdom, and she passed her life accordingly.' Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 202; 520.

It appears from the same authority, that St. Winefride took an active part in the affairs of the church, for it is stated that she was present at a synod, where 'the saints of all Britain were assembled,' and where it was regulated, in regard to those who embraced a religious life, that they should no longer conduct themselves according to their own will in solitude, but that they should serve God in community under superiors. The same Life also seems to intimate that

She assists at a synod.

Ubi supra.

St. Winefride herself, was at that time living in solitude, but that in consequence of the new decree, she was placed over eleven virgins, who lived under her at Gwytherin.

Her death.

At length, in the convent at Gwytherin, 'on the fourth Nones of November,' says the Life which is published by Surius, 'full of virtues and good works, St. Winefride gave back her spirit to God, and was buried near to St. Chebeus and St. Senan.'

Its date.

The precise year of St. Winefride's death cannot be stated with certainty. But it is evident that she survived St. Beuno, who, according to the English martyrology, lived till about the year 660, and most authors are of opinion that St. Winefride died towards the close of the seventh century.

Quoted by Alford, Annal. Eccles. an. 660. n. 21.

Her relics.

The sacred relics of St. Winefride were translated from Gwytherin to Shrewsbury, in the year 1138, and deposited with great reverence in the church of the Benedictine abbey, outside the walls. The Life which has been so freely quoted from the collection of Surius, is the same which, as before mentioned, he attributes to the pen of Robert, or Rupert, Abbot of the said monastery, who flourished about the year 1140.

See above, p. 113.

Life of St. Winefride, Nov. 3.

Butler states that in the year 1391, 'Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, with his clergy in Convocation assembled, ordered the festival of St. Winefride to be kept on the 3rd of November, throughout his province, with an office of nine lessons, which is inserted in the Sarum Breviary.'

She is commemorated on the same day in the Roman martyrology, as Virgin and Martyr.

Martyr. Roman. Nov. 3.

In Angliâ Sanctæ Wenefridæ Virginis et Martyris.

The following ancient rhythm, in honour of St. Winefride, is extracted from the Annals of Father Alford:—

Annal. Eccles. an. 660, nn. 35, 36. t. ii. p. 305.

'Virgo vernans velut rosa,
Agni sponsa speciosa,
Martyr Christi pretiosa,
Wenefreda floruit.
Ex Britannis oriunda,
Fide firma, spe jucunda,
Actu sancta, mente munda,
Mundi menda caruit.

'Hanc occidit Carodocus,
Quem mox sorbet Orci focus;
Qui pravorum extat locus,
Quo Sathan exuritur.
Hujus argumento rei,
Fons ebullit, nutu Dei;
Rubricatæ speciei
Quo caput præciditur.

'Mira multa hic patrantur;
Cæci vident, muti fantur;
Morbi omnes effugantur,
Cum fide petentium.
Gloriosa Wenefreda,
Maris fluctus nobis seda,
Ne fiamus hosti præda,
Pia fer præsidium.'

St. Winefride is the last of the eminent early British Saints of Wales, whose memory has come down to us. Father Cressy, in his Church History

Quoted by Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, p. 321.

of Brittany, continues the list as far down as the year 740, but the additional names which he records are of lesser note than those which have been mentioned.

Cadwallader.

I must not, however, omit to speak of Cadwallader, styled the last of the British kings, who is said to have ended his days in Rome, impelled by religious motives. Geoffrey of Monmouth relates the circumstance as follows:—'Then Cadwallader, renouncing worldly cares for the sake of God and His everlasting kingdom, went to Rome, and was confirmed by Pope Sergius; and, being seized with a sudden illness, was upon the twelfth before the kalends of May, in the six hundred and eighty-ninth year of our Lord's incarnation, freed from the corruption of the flesh, and admitted into the glories of the heavenly kingdom.'

British History, b. xii. ch. 18. Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles, p. 290.

The same event is recorded, with a slight variation in the date, in the *Brut y Tywysogion*, or *Chronicle of the Princes of Wales*, under the year 681, as follows:—'And in that year Cadwalader the blessed, son of Cadwallon, son of Cadvan, King of the Britons, died at Rome, on the twelfth day of May, as Myrddin had previously prophesied to Vortigern of repulsive lips; and thenceforth the Britons lost the crown of the kingdom, and the Saxons gained it.'

Monum. Hist. Brit. p. 841.

It is mentioned also in the annals of the church of Menevia, under the year 689.

Anglia Sacra, t. ii. p. 648.

Both St. Bede and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 688, have recorded a like circumstance in reference

Eccl. Hist. b. v. c. 7. Monum. Hist. Brit. pp. 322, 323.

to Cadwalla, a king of the West Saxons; and it has consequently been thought that the narrative respecting the Saxon king, may have given rise to the similar story in regard to the British Cadwallader. But even if it be so, the very existence of such a mistake is an indication that the British Christians of that period were not looked upon as visibly separated from the communion of the Roman See.

The list of these glorious British Saints is long, but the sketch which has been attempted of each one is necessarily brief and imperfect. It may suffice, however, for the object now in view.

The lives of the British saints testify to the position of the British church.

These saints cannot be regarded apart from the local church and the particular period to which they appertained, and on which they exercised a marked and decided influence. They formed an integral and essential portion of their time and of their nation. If the British Church of the sixth and seventh centuries had been visibly separated from Rome and the rest of Christendom, these its rulers and distinguished members must also have shared in such separation. On the other hand, if these saints were in communion with Rome and the Church in general, this fact in itself is a sufficient proof that the local church with which they were identified enjoyed that communion also, at the period in which they lived. Now, the mediæval writers who have been quoted were not maintainers of any theory of outwardly divided unity. A man who refused submission to the Roman See, or who was the member of any

religious body which systematically refused such submission, as the Anglican body does now; a man who remained visibly separated from the universal body of Christians under subjection to the Roman See, or who continued to hold religious communion with any who were in such a separated position; such a one would unquestionably be in their eyes a schismatic; and such a one could never have been honoured by them as a saint. Therefore, it is evident from the religious veneration which these writers entertained, and which they have so greatly assisted to promote, towards the British saints of the sixth and seventh centuries, that they in no wise regarded them as having been guilty of rejecting the Roman authority, or as in a state of separation from the universal body of the faithful who acknowledged it; and consequently, that they by no means considered the British Church herself to have been thus alienated from Rome and from Christendom in general, at the time when these saints formed her brightest living ornaments.

Nor can it be pleaded in opposition, that such repudiation of the claims of Rome and separation from those who owned them, might have existed unknown to the writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, whose eulogies of the British saints have come down to us. If it were true that, during the preceding sixth and seventh centuries, there really had existed, between the British Christians on the one part, and the See of Rome together with the faithful who acknowledged its authority, on the

other, any visible separation at all analogous to that which now so unhappily divides England from Rome and from the whole Roman Catholic body; it would have been impossible for so important a fact to have been forgotten or overlooked. It must necessarily have become a portion of the history of the day, and, as such, have been handed down to succeeding generations. It would have occupied a prominent place amongst the traditions, from which the writers who have been quoted derived their histories of the angelic lives, and of the heroic virtues and labours of these saints, and it would have been recorded in those most ancient writings of the country, from which, corroded though they were 'by the assiduous voracity of worms,' and the long lapse of years, the before-quoted compiler of the life of St. David, the good Bishop Ricemarchus of the eleventh century, assures us that he collected his materials, 'as if sucking with the proboscis as it were of a most subtile bee, from a flowery garden of diverse herbs (*veluti ex florigero diversarum herbarum horto, quasi subtilissimæ apis rostro sugens*).'

Camb.-Brit. Saints, pp. 143; 446–7.

These sources of information are amongst the most valuable which we possess upon the subject, since scarcely any contemporary documents have come down to us in relation to it.

Intercourse between the British and Irish churches.

Further evidence of the outward communion of the early British church with Rome and the rest of Christendom may be derived from the constant exist-

ence of an interchange of ecclesiastical communion between the British and Irish churches at the period in question. The ecclesiastical relations of Ireland towards Rome and the Continental churches at that time, were of the most intimate character; and if the British Christians had been outwardly severed from the Universal Church, and from its earthly head, the See of Rome, it is not possible that the Irish could have regarded them, as they did, as their own brethren in the faith. Several instances have been already incidentally mentioned of the intimacy which subsisted between the British and Irish churches, and I subjoin a few others to the same purport.

St. Patrick. Brev. Roman. 17 Mart. Bolland. Act. SS. Vit. S. Patric. 17 Mart.

According to the Roman Breviary, St. Patrick himself was a native of Great Britain; though it is a more commonly received opinion that he was born in Gaul. There is a tradition that, before going to Ireland, he passed a short time in Wales, and that he predicted the birth of St. David. Subsequently, when in need of fellow-labourers in his apostolate of Ireland, he crossed over to Britain in search of them, and after successfully combating the Arian and Pelagian heresies in that country, he brought back thence with him to Ireland, 'many lettered and religious men, of whom he afterwards raised thirty to the dignity of the episcopal office.' It was, perhaps, on account of the efforts which Pelagianism was then making to gain a footing in Great Britain, that a canon was enacted by one of the earliest Irish synods, A.D. 450; which testifies to the habitual ecclesiastical intercourse then existing

Synod. S. Patric. &c. can. 33. Hard. Act. Concil. t. i. col. 1793.

between Britain and Ireland. It forbade any one of the British clergy, even though dwelling amongst the people, to exercise his ministry in Ireland, unless furnished with proper credentials from the authorities of his own church.

St. Bridget. Rice Rees, Welsh Saints, pp. 189, 190.

The Irish St. Bridget, according to a vague tradition, also visited Wales. In any case no less than eighteen churches and chapels in that country are dedicated in her honour, and her name is also commemorated in the bay of St. Bride's, whose waters bathe the British shore close to the ancient city which bears the title of St. David's.

St. Cadoc. Camb.-Brit Saints, pp. 25, 313.

The venerable priest dwelling in Wales, by whom St. Cadoc was baptized and educated, is described in the old legend as 'a religious Irishman, who was a hermit and very devout in God's service.'

Ibid. pp. 35, 325.

It is also related how, on attaining more mature age, St. Cadoc sailed over the sea to Ireland, and there studied for three years, until he became perfect in 'all the science of the West.'

St. Canicus. Bolland. Act. SS. 11 Oct.

St. Canicus or Kenny, on emerging from the age of boyhood, crossed from Ireland into Britain, and there lived for some years under a holy Abbot called 'Docus;' probably St. Cadoc. On returning to Ireland he studied under St. Finian at Clonard, and afterwards founded and became Abbot of the great monastery of Aghaboe. He died about the year 599. The city of Kilkenny still bears his name, and solemnly honours him as her patron.

St. Finian.

St. Finian, Abbot, and perhaps Bishop, of Clonard,

Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. i. pp. 464, &c. Butler, Dec. 12.

being on his way home from Tours, visited Wales, and remained there for several years. He conversed with St. David, St. Gildas, and St. Cadoc. Several 'religious Britons' went back with him to Ireland, where he subsequently founded the large monastic school of Clonard, in which were educated many of the principal Irish saints and teachers, who succeeded him.

St. Senan. Bolland. Act. SS. 8 Mart. Butler, March 8. Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. ii. pp. 2, &c.

The Irish St. Senan was a bosom friend of the British St. David. When returning from a pilgrimage to Rome and a sojourn in Gaul,—where, it is stated, that he paid his devotions at the shrine of St. Martin of Tours,—St. Senan turned aside to visit St. David in Wales, and spent some time in his society. At his departure St. David bestowed upon him his staff as a pledge of fraternal friendship, and St. Senan carried it with him to his country. He there founded several churches and monasteries, amongst them the Church of Iniscarra, near Cork. Whilst St. Senan was at Iniscarra, there arrived a ship with fifty pilgrim monks from Gaul,[1] who came to Ireland for the sake

Monks from Gaul seek spiritual instruction in Ireland.

[1] They are described in the second Bollandist life of St. Senan, (cap. iii. n. 20) as 'quinquaginta monachi patriâ *Romani*,' which means, as there explained in a foot-note on the same passage, *Aquitanians* who lived according to the Roman laws, though under the dominion of the Franks. In like manner the canon of the council of Tours, (A.D. 567), which has been already mentioned (p. 74) as prohibiting the ordination of any bishop in Armoricia without the consent of the Metropolitan or the other bishops of the province, is thus worded :—'Adjicimus etiam, ne quis Britannum, aut *Romanum*, in Armorico, sine metropolitani aut comprovincialium voluntate vel litteris, epi-

of instruction in stricter spiritual life, and in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, for which the religious masters in that country were then celebrated. This company was divided into five bands of ten; and each of these five bands respectively, sought instruction from one of the following five Irish saints:—Finian, Senan, Brendan, Finbarr, and Kieran.

St. Senan was also the founder of the great monastery of Iniscatthy, on an island near the mouth of the Shannon. He became Abbot of this house, and he was afterwards made Bishop.

Simultaneous decease of St. David and St. Senan.

In life and in death St. Senan was linked to St. David. No sooner had he heard of that beloved friend's decease, than he himself put off this mortal coil like one falling into a sleep. Thus was fulfilled

scopum ordinare præsumat, &c., &c.' (Hard. Act. Concil. t. iii. col. 359.) The word *Romanum* is here evidently intended to designate a Gaul. In the very ancient life of St. Sampson referred to in the foregoing pages (pp. 65, 66, &c.,) the term *Romania* is more than once used for Gaul, and Dom. Mabillon has appended to it the following note (Vita S. Samsonis Ep. Dolensis, Præfat. n. 1. Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. i. p. 155, not. *a*):—'Id est Gallia, nam Galli antiquitus etiam Romani vocabantur. Vide infra num. 60 & 61, & lib. 2. num. 10. Fortunatus in Vita S. Medardi Episc. Noviom.:—*Mater ejus Romana, nomine Protagia*, quod nomen ad Luitprandi Ticinensis tempora, hoc est ad sæculum x., in usu fuit. Nam in lib. i. cap. 6. De Guidone Comite Spoletano agens, *Cumque*, inquit, *Burgundionum regna transiens, Franciam quam Romanam dicunt, ingredi vellet, &c.* Id tamen Aquitanis ceterisque Provincialibus cis Ligerim, quod lege Romana viverent, ut proprium nomen vindicat Dadinus in lib. 3. de Reb. Aquit. cap. 8.' The above note from Dom. Mabillon is quoted with approbation by the Bollandist Fr. Sollerius, in reference to the same passage (Vita S. Sam. Præfat. not. *d*. Act. SS. 28 Julii).

the mutual wish, which they had expressed to each other when alive, that neither of them should survive the call of either to the Lord.

Bolland. Act. SS. 8 Mart. Vita I. S. Sen. n. 38.

'Nam, ut sibi condixerant dum simul ambo vixerant,
Nolebant ultra vivere, collega non superstite,
Sed' [Senanus] 'mox carne exuitur, sicut qui somno solvitur.'

Welsh Saints, p. 240.

Rice Rees mentions two churches in Wales which are dedicated under the patronage of St. Senan.

St. Maidoc. Bolland. Act. SS. 31 Jan. Butler, Jan. 31.

St. Maidoc, called also Edan, or Aidan,[1] fled from Ireland to escape the honour which was there rendered to him by his countrymen, and became a disciple of St. David at Menevia, where he remained for some years. The Britons esteemed his sanctity so highly, that, being unexpectedly invaded by a Saxon army, they begged St. David to send St. Maidoc to bless their forces; which being granted, a most signal victory was obtained by the Britons, although they were forced into action before they were prepared. Their success was attributed to the prayers of St. Maidoc, and, so long as he remained in Britain, the Saxons never ventured to renew the attack.

St. David at length sent him back to Ireland with his blessing, and accompanied by disciples.

A great number of churches and monasteries were founded by St. Maidoc in Ireland, after his return. He died, according to Ussher, in the year 632, and his memory was held in religious veneration in Wales,

[1] This is a totally distinct person from the St. Aidan who evangelized the Northumbrians, and died Bishop of Lindisfarne, and who is referred to by Dr. Forbes.

and in Scotland, as well as in his own country, where, under the name of Edanus, he is still solemnly honoured by the Church, as the first bishop and the patron of the diocese of Ferns.

St. Finbar and St. Brendan. De Vitâ S. Davidis Lectio vi. apud Wharton, Anglia Sacra, t. ii. pp. 635, 636.

St. Finbar also and St. Brendan are said to have visited St. David, the former on his return from Rome. In fact, Giraldus Cambrensis mentions it as the custom of the Irish saints of those days to make devout pilgrimages to Rome, and to visit Wales, either in going or returning, in order to enjoy the sweet converse of St. David; for his 'name,' he says, 'was as oil poured out.'

St. Carthagh or Mochuda. Lanigan, vol. ii. pp. 350, &c. Bolland. Act. SS. 14 Maii.

St. Carthagh the younger, called also, Mochuda, was the founder of two celebrated monastic institutions, peopled by British as well as by Irish and by Saxons, and by men of all countries.

Monastery of Rathyne. Bolland. Vita ii. cap. ii. n. 14.

About the year 590, he built the large monastery of Rathyne in the county of Westmeath; and he lived in that house for forty years, presiding over 867 monks. He afterwards built a church in the same place, and we are told that 'his fame filled the whole of Ireland, and the island of Britain, and many came to him from diverse provinces of Ireland and Britain, and offered themselves to God and St. Carthagh as monks for ever.' Whilst in this monastery, St. Carthagh was consecrated bishop. About the year 630 he was violently expelled from Rathyne, together with his monks, and after halting in various places, was received with joy by a pious prince, who made him a grant of the land on which Lismore is situated.

Monastery of Lismore.

Here, about the year 633, he established the great monastery of Lismore. It quickly became one of the most famous of the schools of learning and homes of sanctity, which shine forth so brightly amidst the general darkness of those ages.

The feast of St. Carthagh is solemnly kept in Ireland as a double, with mass and office, on the 14th of May, and he is still specially honoured as the patron of the diocese of Lismore. At Lismore he died and was buried, and, says the ancient Life already quoted, 'God alone knows the number of saints who have there been buried after him even to this day. For illustrious and holy is the city[1] of Lismore; half of it is a sanctuary, in which no woman dares to enter; but it is full of cells and monasteries of saints, and a multitude of holy men constantly abide there. For religious men flock to it from every part of Ireland; and not only so, but from England, and from Britain, desiring there to depart to Christ.' *Viri enim religiosi ex omni Hiberniæ parte; et non solum, sed ex Angliâ et Britanniâ confluunt ad eam, volentes ibi migrare ad Christum.*

Cap. iv. n. 50.

Angles and Britons alike flocked to Lismore.

Thus in this holy retreat, and in the unity of the Catholic church, Angles and Britons found themselves alike on common ground. Forgetful of their national quarrels they flocked together to the catholic cloisters of Lismore, and there united in preparation for their last great end. It was not the

[1] *Civitas*—a term frequently applied by early writers to a monastery.

love of study alone which thus quelled their mutual hostility, and drew high-souled men from out of each of their otherwise opposing ranks, to this school of learning as well as of sanctity, which was open to them both; it was a distinct religious end for which they came,—*volentes ibi migrare ad Christum.* This could not have been the case had they been outwardly divided in their religious belief and communion.

In Ireland both nations met on common ground.

It is also to be observed that so soon as Christianity became established amongst the Anglo-Saxons, their religious intercourse with Ireland became as frequent as had formerly been that of the British Christians. Thus the Irish Church afforded common ground for both Angles and Britons, and the fact of both these peoples being in close religious communion with the Irish, is an evidence that, as regards religion, they were not divided from one another, but that the severance which existed between them arose out of other motives and other causes, which were not connected with ecclesiastical matters.

Constant fidelity of Ireland to Rome.

It cannot reasonably be denied by any attentive student of history, that the Irish church was all this while in close communion with Rome and the universal body of the faithful who obeyed the Roman See. From her very commencement and all through her career down to the present moment, the Irish church has always been faithful to the maxim of her great Apostle St. Patrick; who after designating that church as Roman, adjured its members

to be true to Rome as to Christ. This maxim is found, as follows, amongst the proverbs called the *Dicta S. Patricii*, preserved in the Book of Armagh[1]:—*De sæculo requissistis* (sic) *ad Paradisum, Deo gratias; ecclesia Scottorum immo Romanorum; ut Christiani ita et Romani sitis.*

St. Cummian.

Moran's Essays, p. 112.

Thus St. Cummian, in the seventh century, when writing on the Paschal controversy, speaks of deputies sent on the subject to Rome 'as children to their mother',—*velut natos ad matrem*; and also of the early Irish synodical decree, which directed that all causes of difficulty and great moment should 'be referred to the head of cities.'

St. Fursæus.

Ibid. p. 119.

So also the Irish St. Fursæus in the same century declared it to be by the authority of Rome, that 'the body of Christ, that is to say our blessed mother the church, maintains its undying consistency and vigour.'

Various testimony.

Moran's Essays, Part III.

To the same fact bear testimony the early Irish hymns and documents which have come down to us; the earliest canons of that church; the pilgrimages of the Irish Saints to Rome; the Irish Bishops who there received their consecration; the appeals of Irish Bishops and Saints to Rome,

[1] Quoted by Dr. Moran, at p. 23 of his interesting 'Essays on the Origin, Doctrines, and Discipline of the Early Irish Church: Dublin, Duffy, 1864,' a work to which I beg to refer any reader who desires further information respecting the uniformity of doctrine, and the constant visible union, of the Irish church with Rome and with Christendom in general, during the early ages.

and the corresponding communications to Ireland from that See.

Ireland and Christendom.

As regards the early intercourse of the Irish church with the rest of Christendom, it may suffice to call attention to the crowds of students from abroad, who flocked to the Irish monastic schools for the object of religious learning, as well as secular; and to the multitude of Irish Saints, who, having passed over to the continent, are, even to this day, there held in especial honour, as locally connected with different dioceses respectively, throughout the length and breadth of Europe.

The history of the monastery of Lismore furnishes an instance of each of these three particulars.

First:—Its founder St. Carthagh the younger, called also St. Carthagh of Lismore, was the disciple of another St. Carthagh, styled the 'elder,' and described in an ancient Irish list of Saints as 'Carthage the royal one of Rome,' because he was consecrated Bishop in the Apostolic city.

Moran's Essays, p. 140.

St. Cataldus. Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. iii. pp. 121, &c. Butler's Lives, May 10.

Secondly:—St. Cataldus, who became Bishop of Tarentum in Italy, and, after his death, the titular saint of that cathedral, and who has always received the highest veneration in Italy, was a native of Ireland, and a student in the monastery of Lismore. He afterwards became a professor in the same institution, prior to his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and subsequent election to the bishopric of Tarentum.

Thirdly:—Students from various countries thronged to his lectures at Lismore. The Italian author, Bona-

venture Moroni, who wrote a metrical life of St. Cataldus, has therein called particular attention to the circumstance, in verses which are quoted as follows, by Dr. Lanigan:—

Hist. Eccl. Ireland, vol. iii. p. 126.

'Undique conveniunt proceres, quos dulce trahebat
Discendi studium, major num cognita virtus,
An laudata foret. Celeres vastissima Rheni
Jam vada Teutonici, jam deseruere Sicambri.
Mittit ab extremo gelidos Aquilone Boemos
Albis, et Arverni coeunt, Batavique frequentes,
Et quicunque colunt alta sub rupe Gebennas.
Non omnes prospectat Arar Rhodanique fluenta
Helvetios: multos desiderat ultima Thule.
Certatim hi properant diverso tramite ad urbem
Lesmoriam, juvenis primos ubi transigit annos.'

Testimony afforded by Lismore.

Thus the monastery of Lismore was founded by the disciple of a bishop who had been consecrated at Rome; its cloisters and its halls of learning were filled with strangers from many lands; Angles and Britons there united in the pursuit of religious perfection, and of religious as well as secular learning; and one of its earliest professors became a venerated bishop and saint in Southern Italy, where he is still devoutly honoured by the faithful.

St. Cataldus flourished in the latter half of the seventh century. Butler, quoting from Colgan, says that the following verses are placed under an image of this saint at Rome:

Lives of the Saints, May 10.

'Me tulit Hiberne, Sólymæ traxere, Tarentum
Nunc tenet: huic ritus, dogmata, jura dedi.'

St. Cataldus is commemorated on the tenth of May, in the Roman Martyrology, and described as illustrious in miracles—'*Apud Tarentum sancti Cataldi Episcopi, miraculis clari.*'

Communication between the Saxon and British churches.

It has been said that the Britons would hold no communication with the Saxons in England, either on religious or other matters. This must not, however, be interpreted to the letter.

Nor did the Saxon Christians abstain from seeking religious intercourse with the British.

Enough has been said already respecting the unsuccessful attempt of St. Augustine of Canterbury to induce the Britons to conform even to the most important of the general usages in discipline, and to unite with himself and his fellow-missionaries in evangelizing the Saxons, with whom he also sought to persuade them to be at peace. St. Lawrence, who succeeded St. Augustine in the See of Canterbury, renewed the endeavours of his predecessor to persuade the Britons to adopt the Roman and general method of computing the time of Easter, but also, as it appears, without success. We are informed by St. Bede that:—

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. Gentis Angl. lib. ii. cap. iv.

'Lawrence, having obtained the rank of Archbishop, laboured strenuously to enlarge the foundations of the church, which he saw nobly laid, and to advance it to the perfection of its proper height, both by the frequent voice of holy exhortation, and by continual examples of pious works. Again, he not only took care of the new church which had been formed from amongst the Angles, but he was also careful to employ his pastoral solicitude for the

ancient inhabitants of Britain, as well as for the people of the Scots, who dwell in Ireland, an island close to Britain. For as soon as he learned that the life and profession of the Scots in their aforesaid country, in the same way as that of the Britons in Britain itself, was not thoroughly ecclesiastical in many respects, chiefly in that they did not celebrate the Paschal solemnity at its proper time, but, as we have above mentioned, thought that the day of the Lord's Resurrection was to be observed between the fourteenth and the twentieth moon; he wrote, together with his fellow-bishops, an epistle of exhortation to them: imploring and entreating them to hold the unity of peace and of Catholic observance with that Church of Christ which is diffused throughout the whole world; of which epistle, indeed, this is the commencement: —

'"To our most dear brothers, the Lords Bishops, or Abbots throughout the whole of Scotia" (Ireland), "Lawrence, Mellitus and Justus bishops, servants of the servants of God. When the Apostolic see according to its custom throughout the whole world, sent us to these western parts to preach to the pagan nations, and into this island which is called Britain, it happened that we entered it before we were acquainted with the people: we held both Britons and Scots alike in great veneration for sanctity, believing that they proceeded after the practice of the universal church; but when we became acquainted with the Britons, we supposed the Scots to be better. We have learnt however through Bishop Dagan who came into this above-mentioned island, and Columbanus, who came to the Gauls, that they differ in no way from the Britons in their behaviour. For when Bishop Dagan came to us, not only would he not take his food with us, but he would not even take it in the same abode (*hospitio*) in which we eat."

'The same Lawrence with his fellow bishops sent likewise to the clergy of the Britons letters suitable to his rank, by which he endeavoured to confirm them in Catholic

unity (*in unitate catholicâ confirmare*). But how much he gained by doing these things, the present times still declare.'

The Britons were not spoken of as if separated in communion.

It may be gathered from this passage that, though they disapproved of the British practices, neither the venerable historian St. Bede, nor the Archbishop St. Lawrence, with his fellow-bishops, regarded the British Christians as separated from the communion of Rome and the universal church, although they were well aware of the previous conduct of the Britons towards St. Augustine. St. Bede would not have made use of the expression, 'to *confirm* them in Catholic unity,' if he had considered that they were separated from it; and the episcopal letter places the Britons in the same category with the Scots, or, as we call them, Irish, who, it cannot be denied, were in full outward communion with Rome and the whole of the church. In fact, had they not been so, St. Lawrence and his colleagues would not have addressed the Irish clergy as 'most dear brethren.' The letters of St. Lawrence and his fellow-bishops to the British clergy unhappily have not been preserved, but it cannot be gathered from St. Bede's account, that they were less friendly in their character and style of admonition than was the letter to the Scots.

St. Columbanus. Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. ii. pp. 261, &c. Butler's Lives, Nov. 21.

The Abbot St. Columbanus,[1] who is mentioned in the above-quoted epistle by St. Lawrence, was

[1] This St. Columban must not be mistaken for St. Columba of Iona, for though the names are nearly similar, the persons are distinct.

founder of the celebrated monastery of Luxeuil in the Franche-Comté, and also of that of Bobbio in North Italy. Nevertheless, he was an obstinate maintainer of the Celtic computation of Easter, which brought him into trouble with some of the Gallican bishops. St. Gregory the Great was Pope at that time, and to him St. Columban appealed. But the letters which St. Columban addressed to him do not appear to have reached their destination, and the French clergy still causing annoyance to the Irish saint, he again had recourse to the See of Rome, then filled by one of St. Gregory's successors, to whom he forwarded copies of the letters which had been intended for that pontiff. Dr. Lanigan states that St. Columban requested from the Pope 'to be allowed to follow the tradition of his elders, if it was not contrary to faith, and said that he did not disturb others with regard to their observances. "We ask," he added, "for peace and ecclesiastical unity, such as that which St. Polycarp maintained with Pope Anicetus, and for permission to observe our own laws according to the regulation made by the 150 fathers of the council of Constantinople."'[1]

Hist. Eccl. v. ii. p. 272.

Letter to Pope Boniface IV.

After having settled in Italy, St. Columbanus

[1] In a note on this passage, Dr. Lanigan observes (Vol. ii. p. 274, n. 24), 'He alludes to a part of the second canon of that council, in which it is decreed that the churches without the Roman empire are to be administered according to the traditionary custom of their fathers. *Quæ autem in barbaris sunt gentibus, Dei ecclesias administrare oportet secundum patrum, quæ servata est, consuetudinem.*'

wrote his celebrated epistle to Pope Boniface IV. on the subject of the schism of the three chapters. Amongst other titles, he addresses the Pope as 'the pastor of pastors.' Respecting himself and his companions, he says:—'We are the scholars of St. Peter and Paul, and of all disciples subscribing by the Holy Ghost to the Divine canon; all are Irish, inhabitants of the remotest part of the whole world, receiving nothing save what is the evangelic and apostolic doctrine. None of us has been a heretic, none a Jew, none a schismatic; but the faith just as it was at first delivered by you, the successors of the holy apostles, is held unshaken.' He tells the Pope that 'the sheep are affrighted by the approach of wolves,' and exhorts him to 'use the whistlings and the well-known voice of the true shepherd, and stand betwixt the sheep and the wolves, so that, casting away their fear, the sheep may in everything find thee to be the first pastor.' 'Set,' he again says to the Pope, 'set in a manner, higher than all mortals, and exalted near unto the celestial beings, lift up thy voice as a trumpet, that thou mayest show their wicked doings to the people of thy Lord, entrusted to thee by Him.' 'I strive,' he adds, 'to stir up thee as the prince of the leaders; for unto thee belongeth the peril of the whole Lord's army . . . 'fearing do I moan unto thee alone, who from among the princes art the only hope, having authority through the privileges of the apostle Peter.' He expresses his belief that the Pope never

Moran's Essays on the Early Irish Church, p. 97.

Ibid. p. 99.

Ibid. p. 100.

did and never will receive any heretic into communion, and at the close of his letter he declares:—'We, indeed, as I have said before, are devoted (*devincti*) to the chair of St. Peter; for, although Rome is great and renowned, through that chair alone is she great and illustrious amongst us.—On account of the two apostles of Christ you are almost celestial, and Rome is the head of the whole world and of the churches.' *Propter Christi geminos apostolos vos prope cœlestes estis; et Roma orbis terrarum caput et ecclesiarum.*

Lanigan, vol. ii. pp. 290, 294.

St. Columban both Roman and Celtic.

Such was the faith of St. Columban, who, even whilst living on the continent, held pertinaciously to the Celtic computation of the time for the celebration of Easter. His history furnishes a striking illustration that persistence even in this, the most important of the Celtic divergences from the general practice, was not then accounted incompatible with fidelity to the See of Rome, or with visible communion with the universal church.

His commemoration in the Roman Martyrology.

St. Columban, indeed, is particularly commemorated in the Roman martyrology, in terms of more than ordinary eulogy. He is therein mentioned as follows, amongst the saints of the 21st of November:—'In the monastery of Bobbio, the decease of St. Columban Abbot, who, being the founder of many monasteries, was conspicuous as the father of a large number of monks, and who, illustrious with many virtues, fell asleep in a good old age.'

In monasterio Bobiensi depositio sancti Columbani

Abbatis, qui multorum cœnobiorum fundator, plurimorum monachorum exstitit pater, multisque virtutibus clarus in senectute bona quievit.

St. Dagan. Moran's Essays, p. 148, who quotes the Life of St. Molua.

The Bishop Dagan, who is mentioned by St. Lawrence in the same letter, has been supposed to have been the Irish saint of that name, of whom it is related that he went to Rome, and there presented to Pope St. Gregory the rule drawn up by his master, St. Molua; 'and Pope Gregory having read this rule, said in the presence of all:—"The saint who composed this rule has truly guarded his disciples even to the very thresholds of heaven." Wherefore St. Gregory sent his approbation and benediction to Molua.' In the Irish martyrologies, St. Dagan is entitled the 'warlike,' the 'pilgrim,' the 'meek,' and the 'noble.' His extraordinary behaviour on the occasion mentioned by St. Lawrence, although certainly not amounting to a renunciation of ecclesiastical communion, can only be looked upon as an instance of the extremes into which the best of men may be betrayed by party spirit, more especially if they are found on the wrong side of any question.

An opposite instance of meekness during the same century, and in reference to the same controversy, may be found in the conduct of St. Laserian, another Irish bishop, who was a strenuous maintainer of the Roman, or, as it was then called, the new method of computing the Paschal time.

St. Laserian and St. Fintan.

St. Laserian, in his youth, had spent fourteen years in Rome, and, whilst there, he had attentively listened

Bolland. Act. SS. 18 Aprilis, et 21 Octobris.

to the teaching of Pope St. Gregory the Great, from whom also he received the orders of the diaconate and the priesthood. It is stated that, when he was on his way back to Ireland, he was joined by a large number of illustrious men of the Angles, the Britons, and the Scots, who were desirous to be formed after the example of his life. After his arrival in his own country, he became abbot of the monastery of Leighlin, where he presided over fifteen hundred monks. At a synod held in Ireland about the year 630, St. Laserian met St. Fintan, sometimes called St. Munnu, who was as pertinacious in his adherence to the old rule of the Celtic observance of Easter as St. Laserian was ardent in his defence of the new Roman method. In a manner and with a confidence characteristic of the age, St. Fintan appealed to miracles:—

Bolland. Acta SS. t. ix. Oct. pp. 339-41.

'"It is now time," he said before all the people, "that this council should finish, and that every one return to his own place; therefore I briefly propose three things to Laserian, namely:—Let our two books be put into the fire, both the book of the old rule and the book of the new rule, that we may see which book will come out of the fire. Or else, let two of our monks' [one from each side] 'be shut up in one house, and let the house be set on fire, that we may see which of the two will be saved from the fire. Or let us go together, I and Laserian, to the sepulchre of any just monk who has been some time dead, and let us raise him up, that he may indicate to us the Pasch, which is this year celebrated in heaven." To whom Laserian answered, "We will not enter into trial with thee, since we know that, because of thy great labour and sanctity, if

thou wert to order yonder mountain to come down to this plain, and this plain to take the place of yonder mountain, God would do it for thee." Then Fintan answered, "Let each one therefore do as he thinks and believes to be right."'

Thus was the question postponed for the moment, rather than that charity should suffer through contention as to what was not essential; and such was the spirit displayed by Rome throughout the controversy. St. Laserian afterwards went to Rome, with others of the Irish clergy, in reference to the same subject, and he was then consecrated Bishop by Pope Honorius, who also appointed him Legate of the Apostolic See. On his return to Ireland, he successfully exerted himself in establishing the Roman Easter. Pope Honorius also addressed letters to the Irish (A.D. 634), exhorting them, as being a small number situated at the ends of the earth, not to esteem themselves wiser than other churches of Christ, new and old, throughout the world, and not to keep Easter at a different time from that appointed by the Paschal computations and the synodical decrees of the pontiffs of the whole world. These letters produced the desired effect, as St. Bede subsequently informs us, when, in reference to the year 635, he says that the Scots of the South of Ireland had already 'learned to observe Easter according to the canonical custom, by the admonition of the bishop of the Apostolic See.'

Pope Honorius writes to the Irish.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 19.

Eccl. Hist. iii. 3.

The question, however, still continued to be agitated in the North of Ireland, and a few years later Thomian,

Letters from Ireland to Rome.

Archbishop of Armagh, with other bishops and abbots, addressed letters on the subject to the Pope. These letters, as we learn from the reply, reached Rome during the pontificate of Pope Severinus, but were not answered until after his decease, when the proper Roman authorities, including John, the new Pope elect, sent letters in return to the said Irish bishops and clergy, whom they addressed as 'most beloved and most holy.' From the tenor of these letters (so far as they have been quoted by St. Bede) the Roman clergy appear to have been misinformed as to the real nature of the question, for they only speak of and reprove the endeavour to revive the Quartodeciman heresy, of keeping Easter at the time of the Jewish passover;[1] whereas the Celts never observed it on that day, unless it happened to fall upon a Sunday. Consequently the maintainers of the old Celtic practice were not included in the blame which is conveyed by that portion of the epistle which we possess. Their mistaken mode of computation, how-

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. ii. 19.

The reply from Rome.

[1] The writers of the letter say that, having opened the epistles of the Irish clergy, '*reperimus quosdam provinciæ vestræ contra orthodoxam fidem, novam ex veteri hæresim renovare conantes, Pascha nostrum in quo immolatus est Christus, nebulosa caligine refutantes, et quarta decima luna cum Hebræis celebrare nitentes.*' St. Bede does not give the whole of the epistle, but he observes that it is evident from the above passage, that the said error had only recently arisen, and was but partially spread, in Ireland. No trace, however, is found of the existence of the Quartodeciman heresy amongst these Celtic churches, whilst the error as to the mode of forming the paschal computation was of long standing, and widely spread throughout.

ever, may very probably have been noticed in the sequel which is lost, for St. Bede in his previous comments observes that these letters were directed against the Celtic error, and were written 'with great authority, and were full of learning'; the writer of them 'clearly teaching that the Lord's day of the Pasch must be looked for from the fifteenth moon to the twenty-first, which was proved in the Nicene synod.'

Though the above-mentioned circumstances do not directly concern the British church, yet an acquaintance with them is useful on account of their bearing on the general question.

Ecclesiastical intercourse between Britons and Saxons.

For sixty years after the above-mentioned letter from St. Lawrence of Canterbury and his fellow bishops to the British clergy, there is no recorded instance of any intercourse between the Saxon and British churches. But an event occurred about the year 665, which not only involved a direct act of ecclesiastical communion between the British and Saxon clergy, but which also indicates that such communion cannot have been looked upon by either side as broken off; although, no doubt, it was interrupted by the circumstances of the times.

On the other hand, it is to be observed that the history of the antecedents, and of the consequences, of the event referred to, appears at first sight to afford some ground for the opinion that the Scots and the Britons were then regarded as schismatics by St. Wilfrid and the Roman party in England.

Consecration of St. Chad.

The circumstance to which I allude is the consecration of St. Chad, A.D. 665, by the Saxon bishop Wini, assisted by two bishops of the Britons. For the reasons above mentioned, it deserves particular consideration.

The account given by St. Bede of the whole transaction is as follows.

St. Wilfrid elected to the See of York, and consecrated in France. S. Bedæ. Hist. Eccl. iii. 28. v. 19.

On the death of Tuda, who, after the synod of Whitby, had succeeded St. Colman in the bishopric of Lindisfarne, St. Wilfrid was elected to the great Northumbrian episcopate, the seat of which was again transferred to York, where it had originally been established under St. Paulinus, its first bishop. King Alfrid, who at that time governed the province of Deira under his father Oswy, king of Northumbria, sent St. Wilfrid to be consecrated in France, with his father's counsel and consent (*cum consilio atque consensu patris sui Oswii*). Agilbert, at that time bishop of Paris, had previously been bishop of the West Saxons, and having visited Northumbria, had there ordained Wilfrid as priest. Bishop Agilbert had also assisted at the synod of Whitby, on which occasion he appointed St. Wilfrid, whom he styled his disciple, to speak instead of himself in behalf of the Roman calculation of the Paschal season. By the same Agilbert, St. Wilfrid was now consecrated bishop, with circumstances of great honour (*magno cum honore*), in a large assembly of prelates convened for the purpose at Compiègne.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 19.

Ibid. iii. 25.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 28.

Ibid.

Whilst, on this occasion, St. Wilfrid was tarrying in France, King Oswy, says St. Bede, 'having

imitated the diligence of his son, sent into Kent a holy man, modest in manners, well read in the Scriptures, and a skilful executor in his works of those things which the Scriptures taught him were to be done, that he might be consecrated bishop of York.' This was St. Chad, at that time a priest, and abbot of the monastery of Lastingham. With him, the king sent his priest Eadhed, who afterwards was made bishop of Ripon. On their arrival in Kent, they found the see of Canterbury vacant, owing to the death of Archbishop Deusdedit. They consequently proceeded to the province of the West Saxons, where Wini was bishop, who had himself been ordained in France. St. Chad was accordingly consecrated bishop by this Wini, who took, says St. Bede, as his assistants in the consecration (*in societatem ordinationis*), 'two bishops of the nation of the Britons, who, as has very often been said, celebrate the Lord's day of the Pasch at variance[1] with the canonical custom, from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon. For,' proceeds St. Bede, 'there was not then any other canonically ordained bishop in all Britain, besides that Wini.'

Hist. Eccl. iii. 7.

Ibid. iii. 28.

Manner of Wini's appointment.

It is to be observed that Wini appears to have been appointed in an irregular manner to this bishopric, and that this was the reason why Bishop Agilbert

[1] '*Secus* morem canonicum.' In Bohn's translated version, taken from Dr. Giles's, this is rendered '*according* to the canonical manner,' which the context shows to be an error; for it states it to have been their practice to keep Easter 'from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon,' which was *un*canonical.

had left the West Saxons and gone back to his own country. St. Bede relates, in a previous chapter, how there came into the province of the West Saxons, 'out of Ireland, a certain bishop named Agilbert, by nation a Gaul, but who had then dwelt a long time in Ireland, for the purpose of studying the Holy Scriptures.' He subsequently became bishop of the West Saxons, and remained so for many years, until 'at length the king, who understood only the language of the Saxons, having grown weary of a foreign language introduced (*sub*introduxit) into the province another bishop of his own tongue, by name Wini, who himself had been ordained in Gaul; and dividing the province into two parts, appointed to Wini his episcopal see in the city of Winchester.' Agilbert, being grievously offended that the king should have done this without his having been himself consulted, went back into Gaul, and was then made bishop of Paris, where he died.

Hist. Eccl. iii. c. 7.

It was by the same Agilbert, as has been already stated, that St. Wilfrid was consecrated bishop.

St. Bede mentions further, that Wini having been afterwards expelled from this bishopric of Winchester, took refuge with Wulfhere, king of the Mercians, and bought of him the see of London for money, of which he remained bishop for the rest of his life. The city of London was in the province of the East Saxons, at that time subject to Mercia.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 7.

Ibid. iii. 30.

Whatever may have been the motives of King

Oswy,[1] there can be no question that the consecration of St. Chad to a see already occupied by another bishop, was in itself a grievous irregularity.

Consecration and diligence of St. Theodore. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 1, 2.

St. Theodore shortly afterwards succeeded to the see of Canterbury, to which he was consecrated in Rome, by Pope St. Vitalian, in the year 668. During the following year he arrived in England, provided with large powers from the Apostolic See, and he at once applied himself vigorously to the task of ecclesiastical reformation.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 2.

St. Bede relates that :—

He supplies the defects in St. Chad's consecration.

'Theodore, visiting all parts, ordained bishops in fitting places, and, making use of their assistance, corrected such things as he found to be faulty. Amongst these, when he also pointed out to Bishop Chad, that he had not been properly consecrated (*non fuisse rite consecratum*), Chad answered most humbly:—"If you know," said he, "that I have not properly received the episcopate, I willingly relinquish the office; for, indeed, never did I think myself worthy of it; but being commanded to undertake it, I consented, although unworthy, for the sake of obedience." But he,' (Theodore), 'hearing the humility of his answer, said that he ought not to give up the episcopate (*non eum episcopatum dimittere debere*); but he himself completed his ordination anew, in the Catholic manner (*sed ipse ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit*).

[1] Eddius intimates in his 'Life of St. Wilfrid' (cap. xiv.), and Eadmer distinctly states (cap. ii. n. 18), that the Celtic party being annoyed by their defeat at Whitby, fraudulently persuaded King Oswy to substitute St. Chad in St. Wilfrid's place, in the see of York; urging that no one could tell what had become of St. Wilfrid, and that the interests of religion would suffer if that church were left longer without a pastor.

St. Chad's subsequent history.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 3.

St. Chad then gave up the see of York to St. Wilfrid, its rightful possessor, and retired to his own monastery of Lastingham; but he was almost immediately afterwards appointed bishop of the Mercians, by St. Theodore. His see was fixed at Lichfield, where he died.

Difficulties to be solved.

This narrative gives rise to two important questions, respecting which St. Bede does not offer any explanation.

First:—for what reason was St. Wilfrid sent to France for his consecration?

Secondly:—what were the deficiencies which caused St. Theodore to object to the consecration of St. Chad, and which he subsequently himself supplied?

It has been replied to these difficulties, that St. Wilfrid and St. Theodore regarded the Celtic bishops as schismatics; consequently, that the former did not wish to run the risk of being consecrated by them, and that the latter refused to acknowledge the consecration of St. Chad, on account of such bishops having participated in the rite as assistants. The life of St. Wilfrid, written by Eddius a few years before the completion of the ecclesiastical history of St. Bede, is appealed to in support of the above-mentioned explanation.

Eddius Stephanus. Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. v. p. 632. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 2.

Eddius, surnamed Stephanus, was a Benedictine monk of Canterbury, and one of the earliest masters of singing in the churches of the Northumbrians, having been invited out of Kent by St. Wilfrid. He was, for a long time, the friend and companion of

that holy prelate, and immediately after St. Wilfrid's death, in the year 709, Eddius Stephanus wrote the history of his life. The very great value undoubtedly attaching to this biography, as the work of a contemporary, is in some measure impaired by its occasional inaccuracies, and manifestations of party spirit. The chapter on the subject of St. Wilfrid's consecration in France affords a flagrant instance of these defects. In that chapter it is stated that St. Wilfrid addressed King Oswy and his son Alfrid, in a speech which may be literally translated as follows:—

St. Wilfrid's alleged speech to the kings.

'But St. Wilfrid spoke, and said: "O Lords, venerable Kings, by all means it is necessary for us prudently to consider how, with your election, I may be able by the help of God, to arrive at the episcopal rank without accusation from catholic men: for here in Britain there are many bishops, none of whom is it my business to accuse, although I know of a truth, that they are either Quartodecimans, as the Britons and as the Scots, or that they may have been ordained by them, whom the Apostolic see does not receive into communion, nor does it receive those who consent to schismatics. And, therefore, in much humility I ask of you, to send me under your protection across the sea to the country of the Gauls, where many catholic bishops may be had; that without contradiction from the Apostolic see, I may merit, although unworthy, to receive the episcopal rank." This counsel well pleased the Kings, who preparing for him a ship, &c., &c.'[1]

Eddius, Vita S. Wilfridi, c. 12, ed. Gale, Oxon, 1691, vel apud Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. v. p. 642.

[1] I subjoin the original passage:—'Locutus est autem sanctus Wilfridus dicens: "O Domini venerabiles reges, omnibus modis nobis necessarium est provide considerare, quomodo cum electione vestra sine accusatione Catholicorum virorum ad gradum Episcopalem cum Dei adjutorio venire valeam: sunt enim hic in

It is first to be observed that, according to the above statement, the assistance of the British bishops at the subsequent consecration of St. Chad, would not be regarded by St. Wilfrid as an incident out of keeping with the habitual relations then existing between the Saxon and Celtic churches.

The sentiments attributed by Eddius to St. Wilfrid are at variance with St. Wilfrid's speech at Whitby. Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

But it is utterly incredible that St. Wilfrid could have characterised the Britons and the Scots as Quartodecimans on this occasion. For, according to St. Bede, he had expressly declared the contrary in the synod which had recently been held at Whitby. St. Colman, who defended the Celtic practice in the presence of that assembly, appealed to the authority of St. John the Evangelist, as a precedent for commencing the Paschal feast on the fourteenth moon. St. Wilfrid, in reply, admitted that St. John had in this respect complied with the decree of the Mosaic law, out of condescension to the weakness of Jewish converts; adding, however, that, in accordance with the same decree, the said apostle always commenced Easter on the fourteenth, whether falling on a Sunday

Britannia multi Episcopi, quorum nullum meum est accusare, quamvis veraciter sciam, quod aut Quartadecimani sunt ut Britones, ut Scoti, aut ab illis sint ordinati, quos nec Apostolica Sedes in communionem recipit, neque eos qui schismaticis consentiunt. Et ideo in multa humilitate a vobis posco, ut me mittatis cum vestro præsidio trans mare ad Galliarum regionem, ubi Catholici Episcopi multi habentur: ut sine controversia Apostolicæ Sedis, licet indignus gradum Episcopalem merear accipere." Tale jam consilium bene regibus complacuit, præparantes ei navem,' &c., &c.—*Vit. S. Wilf. Ed. Gale.*

or otherwise; 'which,' proceeded St. Wilfrid, in answer to St. Colman, 'is not your practice, for you never celebrate the Pasch excepting on the first day of the week.' Now, the custom to which St. John saw fit, in his day, to condescend, having afterwards degenerated into Judaism, became the principal characteristic of the Quartodeciman heresy; and it has been seen that St. Wilfrid expressly affirmed that the Celtic practice was at variance with it. The Quartodecimans, so far regardless of the Christian Sunday, always kept Easter on the fourteenth moon, whether it fell upon a Sunday or not. The Celts, on the contrary, as St. Bede more than once distinctly mentions, never kept it excepting on a Sunday. But they calculated the said Sunday from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon, whereas, according to the new Roman method, the proper Sunday was to be looked for between the fifteenth moon and the twenty-first. Therefore, it must be concluded that Eddius in this case fell into error, or that he applied the epithet of Quartodeciman in a party sense, and not according to its literal signification; and the same must be said in like manner of the charge which he brings against the Britons and the Scots, of schism and separation from the Apostolic See—which separation only extended to the particular points of divergence, and did not constitute an ecclesiastical schism, in any proper sense of the words.

St. Bede corrects Eddius.

The error of Eddius is very pointedly corrected by St. Bede, who wrote a few years later than

Eddius, and evidently made use of his works.[1] St. Bede, as he himself informs us, derived the materials

Præfatio in Hist. Eccl. Angl.

[1] St. Bede tells us (B. v. c. 23) that he concluded his 'Ecclesiastical History' in the year 731. St. Wilfrid died in the year 709, and the biography of Eddius is said to have been commenced immediately afterwards. The nineteenth chapter of the fifth book of St. Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History,' contains a summary of the life of St. Wilfrid, which is in great measure an abridged paraphrase of the principal chapters in the work of Eddius, with a few additional facts. It is worthy of note that in a passage, evidently paraphrased by St. Bede, Eddius speaks of St. Wilfrid as having learned, amongst other things, from Archdeacon Boniface, at Rome, 'the Paschal calculation, which *the schismatics of Britain and Ireland* were not acquainted with.' St. Bede omits this offensive expression, and says that St. Wilfrid learned from Archdeacon Boniface at Rome, 'the proper Paschal computation, and many other things suitable to ecclesiastical learning, *which he could not have learned in his own country*.' It is worth while to confront these two passages in their original text. Eddius writes of St. Wilfrid, when a youth at Rome:—'Nam per multos menses loca sanctorum omni die ad orationem circumveniens invenit doctorem sibi amicum, per Deum et Apostolum fidelem factum, nomine Bonifacium, Archidiaconum unum ex consiliariis sapientissimum, a quo quatuor Evangelia Christi perfecte didicit, et paschalem rationem, quam schismatici Britanniæ et Hyberniæ non cognoverunt, et alias multas ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ regulas Bonifacius Archidiaconus, quasi proprio filio suo, diligenter dictitavit,' &c., &c. (Edd. Vit. S. Wilfridi, cap. v.) St. Bede exactly, though not verbally, follows the above account, with the exception of the charge of schism against the Celts. He writes of St. Wilfrid on the same occasion:—'Veniens vero Romam, et orationibus ac meditationi rerum ecclesiasticarum, ut animo proposuerat, quotidiana mancipatus instantia, pervenit ad amicitiam viri doctissimi ac sanctissimi, Bonifacii videlicet archidiaconi, qui etiam consiliarius erat apostolici papæ; cujus magisterio quatuor evangeliorum libros ex ordine didicit, computum Paschæ rationabilem, et alia multa quæ in patria nequiverat

for that portion of his own history which treats of the church in Northumbria, not from any one author alone, but from the faithful testimony of innumerable well-informed witnesses, as well as from his own knowledge; and, in two passages, which will subsequently be more fully quoted, he takes pains to explain that St. Aidan and the monks of Iona (who followed the Celtic usages) always kept Easter on a Sunday, 'although not in the proper week,' and that they did not, in company with the Jews, keep it always on the fourteenth moon, 'as some falsely imagine.' This remark apparently alludes to Eddius.

Hist. Eccl. iii. cc. 4, 17.

The work of Eddius must also have been well known to Eadmer, the monk of Canterbury and friend of St. Anselm, who, in the twelfth century, wrote another life of St. Wilfrid. Yet Eadmer does not adopt the reason assigned by Eddius for St. Wilfrid having gone to France for his consecration. He attributes that circumstance to the fact, that Wini was at that time the only canonically consecrated bishop in Britain. He says that St. Wilfrid 'asked of the king not to allow him to be irregularly consecrated in Britain; but, in order that so important a matter might be fulfilled according to the canonical institutes, that he would send him to be consecrated in Gaul. For the venerable Deusdedit, archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury, had already been taken away from

Eadmer, Monk of Canterbury.

Vita S. Wilfridi, c. ii. n. 17. apud Bolland. Act. SS. 24 Apr. vel apud Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. iii. pp. 180, 181.

ecclesiasticis disciplinis accommoda, eodem magistro tradente percepit,' &c., &c. (S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 19.)

this life; nor was there remaining in all Britain any canonically ordained bishop, excepting Wini, Bishop of the West Saxons.'[1]

It will be observed that Eadmer is more explicit upon this point than St. Bede, and, if he had given credit to the statement of Eddius in its literal sense, or had believed that the Britons were schismatics, it cannot be supposed that he would have passed over in silence a circumstance of such paramount importance, which of itself would have afforded an ample and obvious explanation of the conduct of St. Wilfrid, and rendered it superfluous to assign any other.

St. Wilfrid's motives.

It was whilst St. Wilfrid was in France, that St. Chad was sent into Kent to be consecrated by Archbishop Deusdedit, and the said archbishop's death was not known to him, till he arrived. Therefore, the decease of the same archbishop could not have been known in Northumbria when St. Wilfrid previously eft for France. Still, even if St. Wilfrid then supposed that Deusdedit was alive, he might have been aware that there was only one other canonically ordained bishop in Britain to act as assistant in the consecration, and that one Wini. St. Wilfrid might

[1] The original text is as follows:—'Vir autem Domini Wilfridus id a rege petivit ne se inordinate ordinari in Britannia permitteret: verum, ut tanta res secundum instituta canonum expleri valeret, ordinandum se in Galliam mitteret. Venerabilis nempe Deusdedit, sanctæ Cantuariensis Ecclesiæ Archiepiscopus, jam huic vitæ subtractus fuerat; nec in tota Britannia episcopus aliquis canonice ordinatus supererat, excepto Wine Occidentalium Saxonum episcopo.' (Eadmer, Vita S. Wilfridi, cap. ii. n. 17.)

have had an objection to Wini, on account of the manner in which he had been appointed to the see of Winchester, especially since Bishop Agilbert, into whose diocese he had been introduced, was the special friend and patron of St. Wilfrid. These circumstances, together with St. Wilfrid's previous connection with Bishop Agilbert, and with France, and his undoubted objection to the Celtic peculiarities, will amply explain his desire to be consecrated in that country, without any supposition that he imputed either heresy or schism to the Celtic bishops.

Testimony of St. Wilfrid in the Roman synod.

Moreover, some fifteen years afterwards, in a synod held at Rome against the Monothelites, A.D. 680, under Pope St. Agatho, St. Wilfrid himself bore public testimony to the orthodoxy of the Celts, as well as of the other Christians of the British Isles. The circumstance is thus recorded by St. Bede:—

S. Bedæ Eccl. Hist. v. 19.

'At which time the same Pope Agatho, having assembled a synod at Rome of one hundred and twenty-five bishops, against those who taught that there was only one will and operation in the Lord the Saviour, commanded Wilfrid also to be called, and that, sitting amongst the bishops, he should declare his faith, together with that of the province or island from which he came: and when he and his people were found to be Catholic in faith, it was agreed that this amongst the rest should be inserted in the acts of the same synod, and it was written in this manner: "Wilfrid, beloved of God, bishop of the city of York, appellant to the Apostolic see respecting his cause, and acquitted by this power, of things certain and uncertain, and placed in the seat of judgment in synod with one hundred and twenty-five other bishops, also confessed the true and

Catholic Faith for all the northern part,[1] the islands of Britain and Ireland, which are inhabited by the nations of the Angles and Britons, as well as of the Scots and Picts, and corroborated the same with his subscription."'

Now, the Celtic usages respecting Easter and the tonsure, were not wholly abandoned either by Britons, Scots, or Picts, for some time after the year 680. It is evident, therefore, that St. Wilfrid, who was so strenuously opposed to those usages as contrary to Catholic discipline, did not consider them, in the case of these nations, to be at variance with the Catholic faith. Otherwise, he could not at that

[1] In Dr. Giles's and in Bohn's translated editions this is rendered 'the northern part of Britain and Ireland, inhabited, &c.'; but the original text of St. Bede includes the whole of both those islands. It reads as follows:—'*pro omni Aquilonali parte, Britanniæ et Hiberniæ insulis, quæ ab Anglorum et Britonum, necnon Scottorum et Pictorum gentibus incoluntur, veram et catholicam fidem confessus est, et cum subscriptione sua corroboravit.* Ed. Basil, 1563, *also in* Monument. Histor. Britan. 1848, p. 272. In Eadmer's version, however, of the same writing (Vit. S. Wilf. iv. 37), the word *insulis* is omitted, and the passage runs '. . . . *pro omni aquilonali parte Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, quæ ab Anglorum ac Britonum necnon Scottorum et Pictorum gentibus incoluntur, &c., &c.*' But this does not appear to be so good a reading as the other, not only as regards the construction of the sentence, but also because, though there was a special reason why St. Wilfrid should answer for the north of England in which his diocese was situated, there was no such particular reason for his answering for the north only of Ireland. It is easier, therefore, to understand it as including the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, and it is possible that the translations which have been referred to, as well as the reading of Eadmer, are intended in this sense. But even if otherwise, many in the north of Ireland at that time, still persisted in the Celtic usages,

period have so solemnly testified to the catholicity of the faith of the aforesaid nations. Neither can it be conceived that he would have made such a profession of orthodoxy in behalf of the Britons, Scots, and Picts, as well as Angles, if he had regarded any of these nations as schismatics; nor would they have been all thus specially, explicitly, and honourably mentioned in the acts of a Roman synod, if any suspicion had existed that any one of them was in a position of visible separation from the Apostolic See.

Defects in St. Chad's consecration.

As regards the case of St. Chad, there were three grounds on which St. Theodore might take objection to the circumstances of his consecration, without casting any imputation of schism on the British bishops.

First:—it is possible that he may have called in question the competency of Bishop Wini to exercise the jurisdiction which he did in the consecration of St. Chad; especially since Wini himself, as has been explained, appears to have been wrongfully intruded into the see which he then occupied. St. Theodore had probably received full information on this point from Bishop Agilbert of Paris, by whom we are told, 'he was kindly received and long entertained,' on his journey to England through France. But no mention of this difficulty is found in the historians.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 1.

Secondly:—the fact of St. Chad having been consecrated to a see already occupied by another bishop, constituted a manifest and most grave objection, and one which in itself is quite sufficient to explain

his subsequent deposition from that see; though it does not account for the ceremony of the completion of his consecration.

Lastly; it is quite possible that some serious, though not essential, defects may have occurred in respect to ritual. This is the explanation which most fully and satisfactorily accords with the accounts that have come down to us.

It is plain that, in the opinion of St. Bede, there was some canonical defect in the consecration of the two British Bishops who assisted at St. Chad's consecration; for he says that 'there was not, at that time, any canonically ordained bishop in all Britain, excepting Wini.' St. Chad had belonged to the Celtic party in his early days, and, as it has been remarked, that party was suspected of having instigated King Oswy to appoint him to the see of their strong opponent, St. Wilfrid. Wini does not appear to have been scrupulous, and it is by no means improbable that he may have been induced to consecrate St. Chad by the defective Celtic rite. In fact Eadmer, in his 'Life of St. Wilfrid,' plainly intimates that such was the case. He says that, when St. Chad came to Wini for consecration, Wini, 'having taken two bishops of the nation of the Britons who were ordained contrary to the canonical statutes, ordained the same Chad, *in like manner* irregularly. *Assumptis ergo duobus de gente Britonum Episcopis, qui contra scripta canonum erant ordinati, eumdem Ceaddam pari modo inordinate ordinavit.*' From

Hist. Eccl. iii. 28.

Cap. ii. n. 18.

Eadmer, Vita S. Wilfridi, cap. ii. n. 18.

this it would appear that St. Chad was ordained according to the British rite (*pari modo*). The ceremonial deficiencies of the said British rite have already come under observation, and, though they were not essential, yet it might be expected that St. Theodore, whose mission it was to restore and establish ecclesiastical discipline in England, would not pass over those deficiencies without notice, especially when he met with them in the case of a bishop who had been wrongfully consecrated to another bishop's see.

See above, pp. 105, 106.

Probable nature of the defects.

It is not improbable that the canonical deficiencies in question were of the same nature as those which have been mentioned in the case of St. Kentigern, and which are excused by the author of his Life; according to whose narrative they do not appear to have been regarded as essential by Pope St. Gregory the Great. In fact, had there been found amongst the Britons any defect in their mode of conferring the sacred orders, of a nature so serious as to render doubtful the validity of those orders, it could not have escaped the notice of St. Augustine; and it would necessarily have been mentioned by him on the occasion of his conference with the British bishops; whereas, he did not even allude to the point, or include it amongst those on which he stipulated for uniformity. Nor would St. Bede have failed to speak more distinctly upon the subject, had he questioned the validity of the British orders.

Ubi supra.

The said deficiencies, however, constituted an irre-

In what consisted St. Theodore's completion of the consecration.

gularity, and the completion of St. Chad's consecration by St. Theodore may have consisted in his supplement of all the ceremonies, so far as they were wanting, which, though not essential to the sacrament, were prescribed by the canons; just as the omitted ceremonies are supplied after an infant has been privately baptized, although the sacrament is valid without them. Such an explanation appears most in accordance with the fault which St. Bede tells us was com plained of by St. Theodore to St. Chad, viz., 'that he had not been properly consecrated; *non fuisse rite consecratum.*' This expression seems to point to some defect of ritual. So, also, St. Bede does not say that St. Theodore subsequently consecrated St. Chad, but that he 'completed his ordination anew in the Catholic manner;—'*ipse ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit.*'[1]

It is to be observed that St. Bede nowhere manifests the slightest doubt respecting the validity of St. Chad's previous consecration. He tells us that St. Theodore told him 'that he ought not to resign the episcopate; —*non eum episcopatum dimittere debere.*' This implied that he had an episcopate to resign, and must be understood of the episcopal office, not of the see of York into which he had been intruded, and which he did resign.

Throughout St. Bede's history, St. Chad is men-

[1] Natalis Alexander (Hist. Eccl. sæc. vii. cap. viii. § vii. 3), paraphrases this expression by the sentence, 'ordinationem ejus catholico *ritu* consummavit.'

tioned as having been truly a bishop from the period of his consecration by Wini. Thus, in his summary of the life of St. Wilfrid before referred to, St. Bede repeats that:—'Whilst Wilfrid was yet tarrying in the parts beyond the sea, Chad, a holy man, was consecrated to the bishopric of York, by command of King Oswy, as above related, and after sublimely ruling the church for three years, retired from thence to the care of his monastery at Lastingham, Wilfrid receiving the bishopric of the whole province of the Northumbrians.'

Hist. Eccl. v. 19.

The account given by Eddius of the transaction is as follows:—

The account given by Eddius.

'Then, after three years had passed, Theodore, the archbishop, coming from the region of Kent to the King of the Deiri and Bernicians, carrying with him the statutes of the Apostolic see, from which he was sent; at his first entrance into that region heard from true witnesses that a thing had been evilly done against the canons, that, after the manner of a robber, a bishop had dared to seize upon the see of another bishop; at which he' (St. Theodore) 'being indignant, commanded Bishop Chad to be deposed from another person's see. But he, a true servant of God and most meek, then fully understanding the sin of being ordained by Quartodecimans into the see of another bishop, confessed it, and made amends by humble penance, according to the judgment of the bishops, and with his consent he' (Theodore) 'constituted St. Wilfrid bishop in his proper see of the city of York. Then our holy Pontiff,' (Wilfrid) 'according to the precept of the Lord, rendered not evil for evil, but good, as David did to Saul, who said: *I will not put out my hand against the Lord's anointed.* He knew that there was a place given to himself in Lich-

Eddius, Vita S. Wilfridi, cap. xv. ed. Gale, vel apud Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. v. p. 644, and t. vi. p. 561.

field, under Wulfhere, King of the Mercians, his most faithful friend, and that it was ready as an Episcopal see, either for himself, or for any one to whom he wished to give it; and, therefore, having peaceably taken counsel with the true servant of God, Chad, who was in all things obedient to the bishops, they fully ordained him' (Chad) 'through all the ecclesiastical degrees to the aforesaid see (*per omnes gradus ecclesiasticos ad sedem prædictam plene eum ordinaverunt*), and the King receiving him with honour, they appointed him to the aforesaid place.'[1]

It will be seen from the above passage, that, though Eddius again most falsely characterises the British bishops as Quartodecimans, and consequently imputes it as a crime to St. Chad that he should have consented to their assistance in his consecration, yet he represents the gravamen of the offence in the eyes of St. Theodore, to have consisted in the intrusion of St. Chad into St. Wilfrid's see of York. At the same

[1] There is here a manifest discrepancy from the account given by St. Bede; who commences the following chapter (B. iv. c. iii), after that which mentions the completion of St. Chad's consecration, by stating that:—'At that time King Wulfhere ruled over the province of the Mercians, who, on the death of Jurumnan, asking of Theodore for a bishop to be given to himself and his people, Theodore would not consecrate a new bishop for them, but requested of King Oswy that Bishop Chad might be given to them, who was then leading a private life in his monastery at Lastingham, Wilfrid having charge of the bishopric of the church of York, and also of all the Northumbrians, and likewise the Picts, as far as King Oswy could extend his dominion.' From this it would appear, that St. Chad was not removed immediately from York to Lichfield, but that, after the completion of his consecration by St. Theodore, he retired to his monastery at Lastingham, from which Theodore, instead of consecrating 'a new bishop,' caused him to be promoted to the see of Lichfield. St. Wilfrid, very probably, may have been instrumental in the arrangement.

time he indicates that it was thought proper to complete what was considered to be canonically wanting in his orders, not only as regards the episcopal consecration, but also as to the priesthood, the diaconate, subdiaconate, and all the minor degrees;—*per omnes gradus ecclesiasticos eum plene ordinaverunt.* At first sight it might seem from this expression, that his previous ordination to every degree was considered invalid, and that consequently he was altogether ordained anew to each of the holy orders. But the words *plene ordinaverunt* do not necessarily require that interpretation. As in the before-mentioned case of a privately baptized infant, when the ceremonies are afterwards completed the child is said to be then *fully* baptized, although the sacrament itself was fully conferred before; so, in the present case, St. Chad might be said to have been 'fully ordained,' when the ceremonies required by the canons, but previously omitted, were supplied; although, as regards the essence of the sacrament, he was fully ordained before. This interpretation is also most in accordance with the context, which speaks of St. Chad as having been already a bishop. It says that St. Theodore heard *quod prædonis more Episcopus alterius Episcopi sedem præripere ausus sit; indigneque ferens Ceaddam Episcopum de aliena sede jussit deponi.* Again, it draws the comparison between Saul as an anointed king and St. Chad as an anointed bishop, putting into the mouth of St. Wilfrid the words of holy David: *Non mittam manum meam*

in Christum Domini. This interpretation also best agrees with the expression of St. Bede—*ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit.*

St. Chad was a disciple of St. Aidan, and had passed his life amongst the Celts. It is therefore possible that Theodore thought it advisable to supply any canonical defects which might have occurred in each one of the 'ecclesiastical degrees.'

The account given by Eadmer.

The work of Eadmer, already referred to, is peculiarly valuable as showing the sense which an early and impartial author of so great eminence, attached to the writings of his predecessors, Eddius and St. Bede. The circumstances of the transaction under consideration are thus related by him:—

Eadmer, Vita S. Wilfridi, cap. iii. n. 23, apud Bolland. Act. SS. 24 Aprilis.

'But when he' (St. Theodore) 'found that Chad had been consecrated to the rank of the Episcopate contrary to the canonical statutes, he publicly reproved him, and threatened him somewhat severely, that he ought to be degraded from the power,' (or, 'ought rightly to be degraded'?—*quod degradari jure deberet*).' But he being a man of great humility and meekness, "If," said he, "you affirm that I have been ordained contrary to the canonical decrees, I consent with a willing mind to be put out of orders (*exordinari*), since certainly I never appeared to be of such merit that I ought for an hour to preside in this place of rule; but being commanded to undergo this, I consented for the sake of obedience." Pleased with the humility of his answer, Theodore said that he by no means wished to deprive him of the rank of the episcopate (*sacerdotii*); but since, as we have said, he had been irregularly ordained to so high an office, he himself completed his ordination in the canonical manner. But he (St. Chad), considering that he had not justly obtained the bishopric

Vide supra, p. 164.

of another bishop, moved by repentance, chose rather to be without such an honour, than any longer to preside unjustly in another's chair. He therefore relinquished the episcopate, and retired as a private man to his monastery, which was at Lastingham.'[1]

The above-cited passage throws light on the narrative of St. Bede, though it is substantially to the same effect. It seems to bring out distinctly the two points objected to in the consecration of St. Chad. One of them consisted in the fact of his having been

[1] I subjoin the original text :—'Ut vero comperit' (Theodorus), 'Ceaddam contra canonum statuta in Episcopatus gradum fuisse consecratum, publica illum increpatione redarguit, et quod degradari jure deberet paullo districtius minatus est. At ille, ut erat magnæ humilitatis et mansuetudinis vir, "Si me," inquit, "asseris contra scita canonum ordinatum, libenti animo exordinari concedo cum profecto numquam tanti apud memetipsum extiterim, qui loco hujusce regiminis vel ad horam præesse debuerim : sed obedientiæ causa jussus subire hoc licet indignus consensi." Qua responsionis ejus humilitate Theodorus accepta, dixit eum nequaquam gradu Sacerdotii se velle privare : verum quia (ut diximus) inordinate ad tantum ministerium fuerat ordinatus, ipse ordinationem ejus canonica ratione consummavit. Sed ille considerans se non juste Episcopatum alterius Episcopi obtinuisse, pœnitentia ductus, elegit potius tali honore carere, quam alterius Cathedræ ulterius injuste præsidere. Discessit igitur Episcopatu, et ad monasterium suum, quod erat in Lestingesei, privatus secessit.' The above passage contains no intimation that the British bishops were regarded as schismatics. It is also evident from its wording, that Eadmer did not consider the validity of St. Chad's orders to have been called in question ; but that certain ceremonies, not in themselves essential, remained to be supplied, in order to comply with the canonical statutes. The author of the life of St. Kentigern, above referred to, observes that, in a people similarly situated to the British, such deficiencies were excusable, on the ground of ignorance.

consecrated to another bishop's see; the other, in the manner of his consecration. St. Theodore remedied the last defect by supplying what was wanting; but the former admitted of no remedy without the restitution of the bishopric to St. Wilfrid, which accordingly was done.

This explanation removes all difficulties, and, as has been already said, it appears also to accord better than any other with the language of Eddius and St. Bede. Neither of these authors seem by their expressions to indicate the ceremony of reconciliation after schism, as that which was made use of by St. Theodore.

Form of reconciliation from schism.

Schism would not invalidate the sacrament of orders, but the discipline of the church would require that any clergyman ordained by schismatics should be formally reconciled to the church, and confirmed in his ecclesiastical functions according to his rank, before he could lawfully exercise them. Now, the words of St. Bede—*ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit*, even if reconcilable with the use of this ceremony, certainly are not well adapted to express it; and the proceedings mentioned by Eddius are decidedly at variance with the usual practice of the church, in the case of reconciliation of schismatics or their abettors. The form prescribed by the church for that purpose consisted in the imposition of hands, and by this a clergyman, if validly ordained, whatever might be his ecclesiastical order amongst the schismatics, was admitted to the lawful exercise of the functions of the same order in the church, with-

See above, p. 153.

out a repetition of the ceremony for each one of his inferior orders. Thus, by one single imposition of hands, a bishop reconciled from schism would be admitted to exercise lawfully the functions of a bishop in the church, without any repetition of the ceremony for his priesthood, diaconate, subdiaconate, and other inferior degrees. Now, according to the description given by Eddius in the present instance, it was not only as bishop that St. Chad's ordination was completed, but also as priest, deacon, subdeacon, and the rest:—*per omnes gradus ecclesiasticos plene eum ordinaverunt.* It therefore appears certain that Eddius did not intend by this description to indicate the ceremony of reconciliation from schism, or after communion with schismatics, unless it can be supposed that the proceedings adopted in the case of St. Chad were of a perfectly exceptional nature, which is improbable, if not impossible.

See above, p. 168.

This case does not prove the existence of schism.

It does not therefore appear, upon an investigation of the circumstances, that they afford sufficient ground for the conclusion that the British church was in a state of schism. Had such been the case, the ceremony of reconciliation would, according to ecclesiastical discipline, have been indispensable, and it would have been of a different character from the ceremonies which alone are indicated by Eddius, St. Bede, and Eadmer.

But there is another circumstance from which arises a difficulty, at first sight apparently more serious, respecting the ecclesiastical position of the

Scots and Britons at that period. This may be a suitable opportunity to consider it.

Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, printed by command, under the Commissioners on public records: A.D. 1840, vol. ii. p. 63.

There is extant a collection entitled, '*Capitula et Fragmenta* of the works of St. Theodore, taken out of the writings of diverse persons,' which collection is published in the volume referred to in the margin, as a sequel to St. Theodore's *Liber Pœnitentialis.*

Chapter on the Scots and Britons.

Amongst these 'Chapters and Fragments,' under the heading of extracts from 'the Penitential of Theodore,' there is a document which, if rightly attributed to St. Theodore, appears unquestionably to show that, in his opinion, the Scots and Britons who followed the Celtic usages were to be treated as schismatics. The said document is entitled:—

Capit. et Fragm. p. 64.

'*Concerning the communion of the Scots or Britons, who in the Pasch and tonsure are not united to the Catholic church.*'

It runs as follows:—

'Let those who are ordained bishops of the Scots or Britons, who in the Pasch or tonsure are not united to the Catholic Church, have their orders again ratified by imposition of hands from a Catholic bishop. Nor is it lawful for us to give confirmation or the eucharist to those who ask for it, unless they shall first have confessed themselves willing to be one with us in the unity of the church. And, in like manner, let any one of their nation, or whosoever shall have doubted respecting his baptism, be baptized.'[1]

[1] The original is as follows:—

'*De communione Scottorum vel Brittonum, qui in Pascha et tonsura catholicæ non sunt adunati ecclesiæ.*

'Qui ordinati sunt Scottorum vel Brittonum episcopi, qui in

The above document, it will be observed, makes no allusion to any ceremonial defect in the consecration of the Scotch or British bishops. It simply directs that the form required in the reconciliation of schismatics, shall be adopted in their case. This implies a more severe judgment of the ecclesiastical position of their party, than is recorded to have been taken by any other church authority either before or after St. Theodore, or contemporary with him. However, the shadow of authority which renders the above document important, on account of its connection with the venerated name of St. Theodore, is dispelled on investigation, by the discovery of other most strange and most erroneous propositions amongst the collection of writings attributed to the same learned and holy archbishop. So that it is hardly credible that the whole of the said works should have met with his approval.

For instance, in the '*Liber Pœnitentialis*' which bears the name of St. Theodore, and which precedes the *Capitula et Fragmenta* in the volume above quoted, it is directed:—

'If any one shall have been baptized by a heretic who shall not have believed rightly in the Trinity, let him be baptized again.'—*Si quis baptizatus fuerit ab hæretico, qui recte in Trinitatem non crediderit, iterum baptizetur.*

In opere citato, v. ii. p. 38. cap. xxx. § 7

Pascha vel tonsura catholicæ non sunt adunati ecclesiæ, iterum a catholico episcopo manus impositione confirmentur. Licentiam quoque non habemus eis poscentibus chrisma vel eucharistiam dare, nisi ante confessi fuerint velle nobiscum esse in unitate ecclesiæ. Et qui ex eorum similiter gente, vel quicumque de baptismo suo dubitaverit, baptizetur.'

Again, it is directed :—

Ibid. p 19. cap. xix § 23.

'If a woman shall have gone away from her husband, despising him, and not being willing to return and be reconciled to her husband, after five years, with the consent of the bishop, let him take another wife.'[1]

[1] Cap. XIX. § 23. Si mulier discesserit a viro suo, despiciens eum, nolens revertere et reconciliari viro, post v. annos, cum consensu episcopi, ipse aliam accipiat uxorem.' *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England. Vol. II. p.* 19. The following section in the same page, directs :—§ 24. 'Si cujus uxor in captivitatem per vim ducta fuerit, et redimi non poterit, post annos VII. potest alteram accipere. Item si in captivitate ducta fuerit, et sperans quod debet revertere, vir ejus v. annos expectet. Similiter autem et mulier, si viro talia contigerint. Si igitur vir interim aliam duxerit uxorem, et prior iterum mulier de captivitate reversa fuerit, eam accipiat, posterioremque dimittat. Similiter autem et illa, sicut superius diximus, si viro talia contigerint, faciat.' It appears, however, from a note to this passage, at the foot of the page, at the end of which is appended *P. Q. add.*, that there exists some further document, directing that if the captive did not return till after the prescribed time, the first marriage was to be regarded as dissolved. This foot note is as follows :—'Si cujus uxorem hostis abstulerit, et ipse eam adipisci non potest, licet aliam tollere : melius est sic facere quam fornicari. Si iterum, posthæc uxor illa venerit ad illum, non debet recipi, si aliam habet; sed illa tollat alium virum, si unum ante habuerit. Eadem sententia de servis transmarinis.' After this there follow directions respecting consanguinity, &c., and the mark at the end of the note is *P. Q. add.* Natalis Alexander (Hist. Eccles. sæculum vii. cap. iv. art. x.) describes St. Theodore as 'a holy man and learned, and a most zealous maintainer of ecclesiastical discipline.' *Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ acerrimus vindex.* But he adds that 'some things are found in his penitential which are harsh and at variance with tradition and with the Gospel.' '*In ejus Pœnitentiali nonnulla sunt duriora, et a traditione et evangelio aliena.*' He then gives other strong instances which I have not quoted, not having succeeded in verifying them from the volume now before me.

These doctrines are so utterly at variance with the teaching of the Roman and universal church, that they deprive the judgment of their propounders of all weight upon ecclesiastical questions in general. The authors of them, whoever they may have been, may quite as easily have fallen into error in regard to the view taken by the church of the ecclesiastical position of the Scots and Britons, as they undoubtedly have done in regard to her dogmatic teaching, on the more important subjects of heretical baptism and the indissolubility of Christian marriage. Therefore, no real importance can be attached to the document in question, though at first sight it appears startling from the tone of authority which it assumes.

The document has no weight.

Even if this enactment be considered as genuine, it could only have been local. Nor does it appear that it was ever submitted to, much less approved by, the Roman See. There is not a single recorded instance of its having been enforced even in England, unless the case of St. Chad be considered as affording one, in spite of the evidence which has been produced to the contrary. If such an enactment had become practically a portion of the English ecclesiastical law, some notice of it, or some more certain instance of its application, would probably have occurred in the history of St. Bede, or in the pages of other writers.

At the most only local.

Lastly, it should be remembered that St. Theodore was a zealous reformer, and it is perfectly conceivable that his zeal might have betrayed him into undue

St. Theodore might have been mistaken.

severity. We know that he afterwards fell into grievous errors in the matter of St. Wilfrid, which he himself nobly acknowledged, and asked pardon for at the last; and it is possible he may also have erred in his opinion and conduct regarding the Celtic practices. Thus much might be admitted, as consequent on human frailty, without unduly detracting from the character of that great and holy pontiff, to whom the early English church was so deeply indebted, and who is described in the Roman martyrology as 'refulgent with learning and sanctity.' St. Theodore is commemorated therein as follows, on the 19th of September:—

'*Cantuariæ, sancti Theodori episcopi, qui a Vitaliano Papa in Angliam missus, doctrina et sanctitate refulsit.*'

It must also be remembered that, after the Synod of Whitby (A.D. 664), the position of the Celtic party was materially altered. Up to that period the divergences in practice were tolerated on all sides. Afterwards, uniformity came to be enforced within the limits of the English church. The Whitby Synod and its effects will be described when I come to speak of the Scots.

Synod of Hertford, A.D. 673.

My present object, however, requires that I should not postpone the mention of the Synod of Hertford, held under St. Theodore, in the year 673, about four years after his arrival in England, and nine after the aforesaid Synod of Whitby.

In addition to St. Theodore, there were assembled

on that occasion, Bisi, bishop of the East Angles; the legates of St. Wilfrid, bishop of the Northumbrians; Putta, bishop of Rochester; Leutherius, bishop of the West Saxons; and Winfrid, bishop of the province of the Mercians. St. Theodore, having first obtained from each one a general assent to all things defined in the canons of the holy fathers, selected ten chapters in particular, as most important to the present needs of the English church, and these chapters were, in a special manner, accepted by the synod, and subscribed by each one who assisted at it. The first of these chapters decreed:—

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 5.

Acts of the synod.

'That we all in common keep the holy day of the Pasch on the Sunday after the fourteenth moon of the first month.'

The other nine chapters regard other points of discipline, and at the conclusion St. Theodore declares:—

'Whosoever, therefore, shall attempt in any way to oppose or infringe upon this judgment, which is according to the canonical decrees, confirmed also by our consent, and by the subscription of our hand, let him take notice that he is separated from all sacerdotal ministry, and from our society. May the Divine Grace keep us in safety, living in the unity of His holy church!'

There is no doubt that this decree bound the English church to greater strictness than before, respecting the observance of Easter, but it regarded the future, and could not affect the past. Nor does it appear, even in reference to the future, to have been

They applied only to the English church.

considered as excluding from communion those Scots and Britons who lived at some distance, and who still persevered in the Celtic usages, though gradually conforming by degrees to the Roman practice. The pressure upon them became more urgent, but the Church's patience was not exhausted, and they were not visited with any censure. It does not appear that the acts of the Synod of Hertford received the confirmation of the Apostolic See; therefore, besides being limited in the extent of their authority, even locally they would not be supreme.

Synod of Hatfield, A.D. 680. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 17, 18.

In the year 680 another synod was convened, and presided over by St. Theodore, at Heathfield or Hatfield. Its principal object was the condemnation of the Monothelite heresy; and the account of it which has been transmitted to us by St. Bede does not contain any allusion to the Paschal controversy. But a circumstance which was connected with it renders that very silence of some importance as regards the present investigation. St. Bede relates that there was present at it a messenger from the Pope,—'the Venerable man John, Precentor of the church of the holy Apostle Peter, and Abbot of the monastery of Blessed Martin, who had lately come from Rome by command of Pope Agatho, in the company of the most Reverend Abbot Biscop, whose cognomen was Benedict.'

The Abbot John's mission was two-fold. He was to teach the mode of singing as practised in St. Peter's in Rome, in St. Benedict Biscop's monas-

tery at Wearmouth. This he did on his arrival in England. He was also commissioned by the Pope to enquire into the state of the church in Britain, particularly as to matters of doctrine, and to carry back a report to Rome. 'Wherefore,' says St. Bede, 'the synod of which we have spoken having been on this account convened in Britain, the Catholic faith was found inviolate in all, and a copy of its acts was given to him to be carried to Rome.' Abbot John breathed his last upon the way, but the document was duly transmitted to Rome, 'and was most thankfully received by the Apostolic Pope, and by all who heard it or read it.'

No accusation against the Scots, Picts, or Britons.

It may be gathered from the context that this document principally referred to the church of the *Angles*, and also to the subject of the Eutychian heresy. At the same time, if the Scots and Britons, who formed so considerable a portion of the Christians of Britain, had been looked upon as erring in any point of faith, or as schismatics, it might have been expected that some mention would have been made of such a circumstance, in the report thus forwarded to Rome.

This synod, it will be observed, occurred in the same year with that in Rome, at which St. Wilfrid, as has been related, answered expressly for the orthodoxy of all the Britons, Scots, and Picts, as well as Angles, throughout Great Britain and Ireland.

See above, pp. 161, 162.

Death of St. Theodore. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 8.

The great Archbishop, St. Theodore, died in the year 690, at the advanced age of eighty-eight. In the same year, or shortly afterwards, at the request

of a synod of bishops, St. Aldhelm, subsequently Bishop of Sherbourne, addressed to the British Christians of Cornwall and Devonshire, that celebrated exhortation to peace and to conformity with the ecclesiastical practices of the universal church, which constitutes one of the most important features of the history of the controversy under notice.

The epistle of St. Aldhelm to the Britons.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 18.

St. Bede relates that 'Aldhelm, whilst he was yet a priest, and abbot of the monastery which they call the borough of Mailduf' (Malmesbury), 'wrote, at the command of a synod of his nation, an excellent book (*librum egregium*) against the error of the Britons, in that they do not celebrate the Pasch at its proper time, and do very many other things contrary to ecclesiastical charity[1] and peace, and by

[1] I have here substituted the word *charity* for the usual reading, which is *chastity*, on the authority of a codex quoted by Fr. Alford (Annales Ecclesiast. Briton. &c., An. 692, 18, 19, t. ii., p. 407), not only because the expression 'ecclesiastical *chastity* and peace,' appears to be an unusual and unlikely one, but also because, in the work referred to by St. Bede, as it has come down to us, there is not a single word about *chastity*, whilst it may well be described as an exhortation to 'ecclesiastical *charity* and peace;' and it is easy to conceive that through the error of a transcriber the word *castitati* might have been substituted for *caritati*. At the same time it is possible that the short epistle which we possess may be merely the commencement of the whole work which is spoken of by St. Bede. M. de Montalembert (Moines d'Occident, t. v. p. 52, note) observes that it is not easy to believe that short writing to be the whole; and the Life of St. Aldhelm, published by the Bollandists (Act. SS. 25 Maii), as the work of an anonymous monk of Malmesbury, and republished by Dr. Giles (S. Aldhelmi Op. ed. Giles, Oxon. 1844, circa fin.) as the

the reading of this he brought many of those Britons who were subject to the West Saxons, to the Catholic celebration of the Lord's Pasch.'

St. Aldhelm's birth and education. Moines d'Occident, t. v. pp. 27, &c.

St. Aldhelm derived his birth from the royal family of the kings of Wessex. He owed his education partly to a Scottish hermit named Maildulfus, who had settled in England on the borders of Wessex and Mercia; but principally to the Abbot Adrian, who had accompanied St. Theodore from Rome into England, and who afterwards remained there and assisted that prelate in his labours. The hermitage of Maildulfus, and the community which gathered round him, formed the commencement of the great religious house of Malmesbury, of which St. Aldhelm became one of the earliest monks and abbots. The holiness of his life and the eminence of his literary acquirements caused his fame to be widely spread. We find Irish amongst the many who paid their homage to his attainments, and in one of the epistles of St. Aldhelm there occurs a remarkable illustration of the intimate intercourse, which at that time subsisted between the Irish and the Saxon Christians, equalling, as has before been said, the constant inter-

Commencement of Malmesbury.

The Saxons as well as Britons were in close intercourse with Ireland.

work of Faricius, who wrote prior to William of Malmesbury, seems to speak (cap. ii.) of 'many inventions and authentic traditions of the holy fathers, and the hymn delivered to Abbot Pachomius by the angels, and the sufficiently plain teaching of other religious,' as having been sent by St. Aldhelm to the Britons, whereas the short writing now extant contains none of these things. It must be observed, however, that the said Life can by no means be relied upon for accuracy of expression.

course between the Irish and the British, and thus showing that, in religion, Britons and Saxons were united, since both are found to have been in common and close relation with the Catholics of Ireland.

St. Aldhelm's letter to Eahfrid. Opera, ed. Giles, pp. 91, &c.

The epistle to which I refer was addressed by St. Aldhelm to his friend and compatriot Eahfrid, on his return from 'the wintry region of Ireland, where for about twice three years he had been sucking the teat of wisdom.' St. Aldhelm speaks of the crowds of both nations who then crossed the waters to and fro, between the English and the Irish shores, like a tribe and family of bees skilfully compounding nectar. *Siquidem tam creber meatus est* (*istinc illincque, istuc illucque*) *navigero æquoreas fretantium calle gurgites, velut quædam contribula apium germanitas nectar fabre conficientium.* Thus, he says, from the flowery fields of holy study (*florigeris hagiographæ ex arvis*), and from constant meditation, do the scholars store up treasures in the hives of wisdom. He asks why crowds thus flow to Ireland, as if Britain had no masters who could solve the problems of celestial learning? For though Ireland might rival the firmament of heaven in the number of her brilliant stars, yet Britain, he says, possessed a fiery sun in the Pontiff Theodore, versed in philosophy from his youth, and a luminous moon in his companion Adrian, 'ineffably gifted with unmixed urbanity.' He draws a graphic picture of Theodore surrounded by a crowd of Irish students, who are overthrown by the force of his arguments and syllogisms.

St. Aldhelm amongst the peasants.

St. Aldhelm, however, was not a mere literary *dilettante*, though it might possibly be so conjectured from his style; nor did he employ his talents only in compositions to please the learned. He was a man of mortified life and earnest piety; full of warm affection to all around him, though austere in the treatment of himself. His heart was filled with love for God and for his neighbour, and it burnt with ardent zeal for the salvation of human souls. The country people amongst whom he lived were semi-barbarous and ill instructed, and would not give their attention to any serious discourse. To win them and to teach them, St. Aldhelm composed suitable songs in their own language, and William of Malmesbury relates that it was his practice to take up his station on a bridge which the people used to cross on their return from mass; and under the pretext of teaching them to sing, for he was well skilled in music, he engaged their attention, and collected them around him. He would then so happily blend serious teaching and sentences from Scripture, with lighter and familiar and even jocular conversation (*sensim inter ludicra verbis scripturarum insertis*), that he succeeded in effecting their reformation when severer measures might have failed.

De Pontif. Angl. lib. v., apud Wharton, Angl. Sacra, t. ii. p. 4.

He is asked to write to the Britons.

Such being the habits and the character of this holy and accomplished man, it is not surprising that the English bishops should have entrusted to him a task in every way so congenial to his disposition and so suitable to his ability, as the endeavour to effect a

reconciliation with the Britons dwelling in that region, and to persuade them to abandon their religious peculiarities. Accordingly, at the request of a large synod, St. Aldhelm addressed to them a friendly,[1] but

[1] St. Aldhelm, as will be seen, did not address the British dissentients as schismatics; yet William of Malmesbury does not scruple to speak of them as such. He says (apud Wharton, Anglia Sacra, t. ii. p. 15) that after much deliberation it was decided 'that the *schismatics* must not be forced, but reasoned with,' *non vi cogendos schismaticos, sed rationibus ducendos*; and that St. Aldhelm was entreated by all to undertake 'this labour for the conversion of the *schismatics*, the reputation of his country, and the salvation of all in common.' Faricius, who is stated by Dr. Giles to have been the author of the Life of St. Aldhelm which is given by the Bollandists, is even betrayed into the assertion that 'certain of the British who in name were bishops (*nomine tenus præsules*) hereticised (*hæretizabant*) respecting the Paschal time, and many other institutions of ecclesiastical orthodoxy;' (Act. SS. 25 Maii, Vit. S. Ald. c. ii. n. 14. S. Ald. Op. ed. Giles, p. 363) and he says (ed. Giles, p. 364) that the holy synod asked the venerable Abbot Aldhelm, though as yet only a priest, 'to compose an excellent book by which the malignant heresy of the Britons, which was then springing up beyond measure, might be destroyed.' In other passages also he designates the peculiarities of the British as *heresy*. On which the Bollandist Father Henschenius justly observes (Vita S. Ald. 25 Maii, cap. ii. n. 14, annot. h.) that their conduct should have been qualified as 'custom' (*consuetudo*), rather than heresy (*hæresis*). It has more than once been pointed out that the Paschal error of the Britons did not amount to heresy. And we are told by William of Malmesbury himself, in connection with the transaction before us, that this was the most important of their errors. After speaking of their temporal misfortunes, he says of them (Anglia Sacra, t. ii. p. 14):—*Accedebat miseris error sacratæ credulitatis; qui quasi extra orbem positi suis potius quam Romanis obsecundarent traditionibus. Et plura quidem alia catholica, sed illud potissimum abnuebant; ne Paschale sacrum legitimo die celebrarent.* It is evident therefore, that Faricius, or whoever may have been the author

earnest and free-spoken, exhortation to conformity with the Roman and universal customs, respecting the calculation of the time of Easter, and the form of the ecclesiastical tonsure; as well as to a greater manifestation of Christian charity in their conduct towards the Saxons. His epistle is headed as follows:—

Heading of his epistle. S. Aldhelmi Op. ed. Giles, p. 83.

'To the most glorious Lord, who governs the kingdoms of the West, whom I, as the Searcher of hearts and reins is witness, embrace in fraternal charity, Geruntius King, and together with him all the priests of God dwelling throughout the Damnonian regions, Aldhelm, who without title of merit fulfils the office of Abbot, salvation to be wished for in the Lord!'

Domino gloriosissimo, occidentalis regni sceptra gubernanti, quem ego, ut mihi Scrutator cordis et renum testis est, fraterna caritate amplector, Geruntio Regi, simulque cunctis Dei Sacerdotibus per Damnonia conversantibus, Aldhelmus, sine meritorum prærogativa Abbatis officio functus, optabilem in Domino salutem!

of the Life attributed to him by Dr. Giles, had no sufficient authority for the application of the term *heresy* to the British errors. It was probably a mere expletive of his own in addition to the words of St. Bede, which in other respects he has more or less adopted. Such occasional ignorant or unguarded expressions imputing schism or heresy to the Britons, occasionally met with in a very few early writers, cannot be counted of so great moment as to outweigh the united mass of counter testimony, collected from many separate though collateral sources. It will, moreover, be shown that the epistle in which St. Aldhelm addressed the British on this occasion, contains evidence in itself that they were neither heretics nor schismatics.

Besides Devonshire, the plural term *Damnonia* must here be understood to include Cornwall, from which Geruntius derived his title of king. He ruled over the Britons in those provinces in subjection to Ina, the Saxon King of Wessex.

Its commencement.

After the above fraternal salutation, which does not breathe even the most distant suspicion of schism, St. Aldhelm says that he has been commissioned by a large synod of bishops, assembled from nearly the whole of Britain, to express 'to your piety (*ad vestræ pietatis præsentiam*),' in an epistle, 'their paternal petition and salutary suggestion (*eorum paternam petitionem, salubremque suggestionem*), that is concerning the unity of the Catholic church, and the concord of the Christian religion,' without which unity and concord, no future reward can be gained. For what, he asks, is the profit of good works or even of the life of a monk or of a hermit, if it be outside the Catholic church? He says that it is known through diverse reports, that their priests by no means agree in the rule of the Catholic faith, and that 'through their contests and fightings of words, there arise in the church of Christ, serious division and cruel scandal (*grave schisma et crudele scandalum nascatur*).' He reminds them that heretics and schismatics, who are extraneous to the church, form a blot in the harvest of the Lord, like tares amongst the wheat, and he quotes various texts of Scripture in praise of unity and peace. But though he speaks so strongly on this point, he does not say that the British Chris-

tians are themselves cut off from the church; at the same time it seems to be his wish to warn them against the danger of continuing to pursue a line of conduct which so nearly savoured of schism.

The question did not concern the faith.

St. Aldhelm's above-mentioned charge of divergence from the faith, appears at first sight more serious than it proves to have been when he enters into particulars. For he proceeds to specify as contrary to the faith, the fashion of their clerical tonsure, asserting that certain of their priests and clergy pertinaciously refuse the tonsure of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, preferring to it the form which they had inherited from their ancestors, and of which he declares that Simon Magus was the inventor. It is evident that this question had nothing to do with the faith; moreover, St. Aldhelm was mistaken in assigning these authors for each of the opposite forms of tonsure respectively.

'But,' he proceeds, 'there is another more cruel destruction of souls,' inasmuch, he says, as the Britons, instead of following the decrees of the Council of Nicæa in their computation of the period of Easter, observe the rule of Sulpitius Severus, and 'celebrate the Paschal mystery on the fourteenth moon, with the Jews,' at variance with the Roman church. He does not, at the same time, appear to accuse them of being Quartodecimans, but he tells them that there was a sect of heretics of that name in the east, so called because they kept Easter on the fourteenth moon, together with the blaspheming Jews, and that

the said sectarians were therefore accounted to be schismatics, and 'alien from the blessed fellowship of the orthodox.'

St. Aldhelm misapprehended the facts on certain points.

It is evident that St. Aldhelm was equally misled by popular belief in reference to the Paschal controversy, as he was regarding the tonsure. The Nicene synod decreed that Easter was to be observed by all, at the time then most general, viz., on the first Sunday after the fourteenth moon; but it did not define anything as to the astronomical calculation by which this period was to be discovered. The Britons had anciently received their method of computing it from Rome, and the fact of their keeping it on the fourteenth moon, when it chanced to fall upon a Sunday, arose simply out of a mistake, as will be more fully explained hereafter. They were only too faithful to the old Roman tradition, and too slow to acquiesce in the reform which Rome had adopted.

Thus, even if St. Aldhelm had charged the British Christians with heresy or schism on either of the grounds above mentioned, the misapprehension under which he laboured respecting them would have deprived his accusations of any force, and rendered them useless as testimony. The same remark will apply to those few other writers above mentioned, who actually speak of the British in question as heretics and schismatics.

British behaviour to Saxon settlers.

In the next place, St. Aldhelm complains of the severity which the Britons manifested towards the Saxons, and he designates their want of charity as at

variance with 'the Catholic faith,' showing by this application of the term—'Catholic faith'—that it need not be construed in its literal sense when met with in other parts of the same letter. The passage shall be given in full, as affording one of the strongest and most striking illustrations on record, of the intensity of the national antipathy entertained by the Britons towards the Saxons. It is as follows:—

'But how greatly is it at variance with Catholic faith, and discordant from evangelical tradition, that the priests of the Demetæ' (the district comprising the modern St. David's), 'beyond the frith of the river Severn, glorying in their own peculiar holiness of life, exceedingly abominate our communion, so that neither in the church will they condescend to celebrate with us the offices of prayer, nor at table in like manner to partake with us in any dish of food, for the sake of charity; nay, they even cast the fragments of our dishes, and the remnants of our meals, to the jaws of ravenous dogs, and to be devoured by filthy pigs. Our vessels also and cups they command to be purged and purified, either with the gravel and sand of the earth, or with the yellow ashes of embers. No peaceful salutation is presented, no kiss of pious brotherhood is offered, according to the word of the Apostle: *Salute one another with a holy kiss*; neither is any ointment or water, with a towel, held for the hands, nor any basin set as a bath for the feet, though the Saviour, girt about with a napkin, washing the feet of His disciples, delivered to us a rule to be imitated, saying, *As I have done, so also do you to others.* But, indeed, if any one from ours, that is, from Catholics (*si quilibet de nostris, id est Catholicis*), shall have gone to them to take up their habitation, they do not vouchsafe to admit them to their fellowship till they have been compelled to pass through forty days of penance. And in this

they unhappily imitate the heretics, who wished to be called Cathari, that is, pure. Alas! alas! for so great errors,' &c., &c., &c.[1]

He goes on to remind them how our Lord, unlike the Pharisees, ate with publicans and sinners, and forgave and comforted the penitent Magdalene.

Testimony afforded by this passage to British catholicity.

It cannot be denied that the above passage reveals a spirit of extreme severity on the part of the Britons towards those who, as St. Aldhelm in the above passage takes care to remind them, were their fellow

[1] The passage is so remarkable that it deserves to be quoted in the original, which is subjoined:—'Illud vero quam valde a fide Catholica discrepat, et ab Evangelica traditione discordat, quod ultra Sabrinæ fluminis fretum Demetarum sacerdotes de privata propria conversationis munditia gloriantes nostram communionem magnopere abominantur, in tantum, ut nec in Ecclesia nobiscum orationum officia celebrare, nec ad mensam ciborum fercula, pro caritatis gratia, pariter percipere dignentur: quin immo fragmenta ferculorum, et reliquias epularum lurconum canum rictibus et immundis devorandas porcis projiciunt. Vascula quoque et phialas aut arenosis sablonum glareis, aut fulvis favillarum cineribus expianda purgandaque præcipiunt. Non salutatio pacifica præbetur, non osculum piæ fraternitatis offertur, dicente Apostolo: Salutate vos in osculo sancto; nec manibus lomentum, aut latex cum manutergio exhibetur, neque pedibus ad lavacrum pelvis apponitur, cum Salvator sindone præcinctus discipulorum pedes abluens, normam nobis tradiderit imitandi, dicens: Sicut ego feci, ita et vos facite aliis. Ast vero si quilibet de nostris, id est Catholicis, ad eos, habitandi gratia, perrexerint, non prius ad consortium sodalitatis suæ adsciscere dignantur, quam quadraginta dierum spatia in pœnitendo peragere compellantur. Et in hoc hæreticos infeliciter imitantur, qui se Katharos, id est mundos, nuncupari voluerunt. Heu! heu! pro tantis erroribus, &c., &c.'—*S. Aldhelmi Op. ed. Giles*, pp. 86, 87.

Catholics; but it also renders it manifest, beyond all question, that the Britons were not regarded as heretics or schismatics by the Catholics who thus sought their communion. The express ground of St. Aldhelm's complaint is that Saxon Catholics were not admitted by the British priests to participation in religious rites and in Christian fellowship, until they had undergone a penance of forty days. Now, if the British Christians had been supposed to be guilty either of heresy or schism, it is certain that no Catholic would have sought to unite with them in religious fellowship, nor even have consented to do so if solicited, much less would he have undertaken a course of penance in order to obtain admission to their communion. It would therefore appear that there was no question on either side respecting schism, beyond the fact that the Britons treated the Saxons as excommunicated, and would not release them from the ban till after penance. St. Aldhelm does not allude to the motives for this severity, but from what has been already stated it may be gathered, that it was in consequence of the Saxons having retained possession of the territory from which their forefathers had originally expelled the Britons.

The conduct of the Saxons towards St. Wilfrid and his friends.

The proceedings above described by St. Aldhelm, as adopted by the Britons towards the Saxons, correspond with the course which, according to Eddius, was on one occasion pursued by the Saxon Catholics themselves, towards their fellow-countrymen and fellow-catholics, St. Wilfrid and his adherents. St.

Wilfrid had appealed to Rome against the uncanonical proceedings of King Alfrid, who was supported by Berthwald, Archbishop of Canterbury, together with other bishops assembled in Synod. Whereupon, before the said appeal could be heard, Eddius states that his opponents declared St. Wilfrid and his friends to be cut off from their own communion; that they treated their blessing as if it brought a curse, and the sacred vessels which they used, as if polluted by their touch. Such may have been the course usually pursued at that time towards those who were excommunicated. Eddius describes the behaviour of these Saxons in the following short chapter:—

'XLVII. CONCERNING OUR EXCOMMUNICATION.

Eddius, Vita S. Wilfridi, ed. Gale, p. 77, vel apud Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. v. p. 664.

'But the enemies who usurped to themselves the heritage of our holy Pontiff' (St. Wilfrid), 'announcing that we, together with such as should partake with us, were cut off from the lot of the faithful, held our communion in such execration, that if any one of our abbots or priests, at the request of one of the faithful from amongst the people, should bless with the sign of the cross of God the refreshment set before him, they pronounced that it was to be cast out of doors, and poured out as if idolatrous; and they ordered the vessels of God which ours made use of, to be first washed, as if polluted with filth, before they should be touched by others.'[1]

---

[1] I subjoin the original text:—

'XLVII. *De excommunicatione nostra.*

'Inimici vero qui hæreditatem sancti Pontificis nostri sibi usurpabant, annuntiantes nos esse a sorte fidelium segregatos, et eos qui nobiscum participarent; in tantum communionem nostram execraverunt, ut si quispiam Abbatum, vel Presbyterorum nostrorum, a fideli de plebe rogatus, refectionem suam

Position of both sides amongst the English.

Here, then, we find an instance of local ecclesiastical schism amongst the English Catholics themselves, in which the extreme behaviour of one side towards the other was the very counterpart and parallel of the conduct of the Britons towards the Saxons. Yet no one can deny that, in the matter of St. Wilfrid, both the contending parties were in full visible communion with Rome and the universal church. It is remarkable that Eddius himself, in relating the events which induced St. Wilfrid to appeal to Rome, does not hesitate to apply the epithet of 'holy' to the hostile Archbishop Berthwald. He commences his account of the transaction as follows:—'Igitur Alfredo rege cum *sancto* Berthwaldo Archiepiscopo, et totius pene Britanniæ Episcopis, congregata synodo,' &c. &c.

Vit. S. Wilf. c. 45.

Rome decided in favour of the locally and unjustly excommunicated St. Wilfrid. His excommunication was as unjustifiable as that of the Saxons by the

ante se positam signo crucis Dei benediceret, foras projiciendam, et effundendam, quasi idolothytum, judicabant; et vasa Dei quibus nostri vescebantur, lavari prius, quasi sorde polluta jubebant, antequam ab aliis contingerentur.' (Vit. S. Wilf. ed. Gale.)

Dr. Lingard, through an oversight, has quoted the latter part of the above chapter, as if it referred to the conduct of the Britons towards the Saxons. (Antiq. Angl.-Sax. Church, vol. i. pp. 56, 57; and note 1, ibid.; ed. London, 1858). A reference to the original work of Eddius will at once show that the learned historian has here fallen into a mistake. In fact, this is evident from the commencement of the same chapter, for it is well known that the Saxon authorities, and not the British, were the 'enemies who usurped the' ecclesiastical 'heritage' of St. Wilfrid.

Britons; and the King, with the Archbishop and the other Bishops who took part against him, were notoriously in the wrong; yet not one of them was ever looked upon as separated from the visible communion of the Roman Catholic Church, notwithstanding their extreme conduct as described by Eddius.

St. Aldhelm's appeal to religious fellowship.

After complaining, as above mentioned, of the behaviour of the Britons towards the Saxons, St. Aldhelm appeals to the common tie of religious fellowship which subsisted between them, adjuring and imploring them thereby, no longer to prefer their own traditions to those of the Roman Church. At the same time he vigorously denounces their presumption and disobedience, and, strongly asserting the prerogatives of St. Peter, he warns them earnestly against the consequences to be apprehended, if they persevere in rejecting the Roman usages.

Op. S. Ald. ed. Giles, pp. 87, 88.

'Since these things are so,' he says, alluding to the aforesaid grounds of complaint, 'adjuring your fraternity, with earnest prayers and bended knees, through our common share in the celestial country and union of angelic fellowship, we suppliantly and earnestly ask of you, no longer with stubborn pride of heart and haughty breast, to abhor the doctrine and decrees of blessed Peter, and by no means confiding in despotic pertinacity, arrogantly to reject the traditions of the Roman Church on account of the ancient statutes of your forefathers.'

Quæ cum ita se habeant, propter communem cœlestis patriæ sortem et angelicæ sodalitatis collegium, sub-

nixis precibus et flexis poplitibus vestram fraternitatem adjurantes suppliciter efflagitamus, ut ulterius doctrinam et decreta beati Petri contumaci cordis supercilio et protervo pectore non abominemini, et traditionem Ecclesiæ Romanæ propter prisca priorum statuta vestrorum nequaquam tyrannica freti pertinacia, arroganter aspernemini.

It must again be observed that the practices which St. Aldhelm here speaks of as grounded on the doctrine and decrees of blessed Peter, were in reality the result of comparatively recent reforms; and that the old ancestral statutes to which the Britons so tenaciously clung, were actually in accordance with the ancient tradition of the Roman Church, from which they had originally derived them. At the same time their obstinate refusal to conform to the improved customs could only be excused on the plea of ignorance. St. Aldhelm unsparingly reproves them for it, but in the form of fraternal expostulation, adjuring them by their part with the Saxon Christians in the kingdom of heaven, and by the union of angelic fellowship (*propter communem cœlestis patriæ sortem, et angelicæ sodalitatis collegium*). It cannot be supposed that he would have addressed them in these terms, if they had been separated from the visible communion of Rome and the universal Church.

St. Aldhelm's appeal to the authority of Rome.

St. Aldhelm appeals to the authority of St. Peter's See as to an acknowledged fact, and he makes it the principal ground and the crowning conclusion of his argument, without any intimation that the Britons

called it in question, though they did not follow it on the points of discipline he refers to. Thus, immediately after the passage last quoted, St. Aldhelm proceeds to cite the words of Christ from St. Matthew's Gospel, by which He constituted St. Peter the rock on which His Church was to be built, and confided to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the supreme power of binding and loosing upon earth. 'Who, then,' asks St. Aldhelm, 'that despises the principal statutes of his' (St. Peter's) 'church, and makes no account of its doctrinal mandates (*doctrinæ mandata contemnens*), can enter, and be joyfully greeted, through the gate of the heavenly paradise? And if he' (Peter), 'by happy lot and peculiar privilege, deserved to receive the power of binding and the monarchy of loosing in heaven and in earth, who that refuses the rule of the Paschal feast, and the rite of the Roman tonsure, will not altogether consider that, in place of being absolved with clemency, he is the rather to be inextricably bound with tightened fetters?'

Ch. xvi. 18, 19.

It might certainly have been justly replied to St. Aldhelm, that neither the rule for computing the time of Easter, nor for shaping the form of the clerical tonsure, was amongst the principal statutes or doctrinal mandates of the Roman church, and that these matters had never been treated by her as essential questions. But, though the Saxon Abbot's zeal, and the local spirit of the day, induced him to overrate the importance of these particulars, it is instructive

to observe how unhesitatingly this great father of the church of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, enforces the necessity of communion with Rome in order to everlasting salvation.

Fruitlessness of faith without obedience.

'Perchance,' he proceeds after the last-mentioned sentence, 'perchance some dexterous reader of books, and shrewd judge of the Scriptures (*quilibet strophosus librorum lector, ac sagax scripturarum disceptator*), may defend himself' with the excuse that he holds the Christian faith in its fulness, and on that account may urge his title to be numbered amongst Catholics; asserting, after the recitation of his creed,—'hujus fidei privilegio in Catholicorum cœtu glomeratus sine aliquo infelicitatis obstaculo connumerabor.' To this St. Aldhelm replies, in the words of the epistle of St. James,—'Thou believest that there is one God. Thou dost well: the devils also believe and tremble, because faith without works is dead.' Then, after quoting St. Paul to show that faith without charity is of no avail, St. Aldhelm concludes his epistle, or that portion of it which we possess, with the following remarkable words:—

ii. 19, 20.

1 Cor. xiii. 2.

Authority of St. Peter's See.

'And to conclude all within the compass of a short sentence, in vain does that man emptily glory in the Catholic faith, who follows not the doctrine and the rule of Holy Peter. Certainly the foundation of the church and the support of the faith, established principally in Christ, and after Him in Peter, shall in no degree vacillate or totter through the tempests and whirlwinds that assail it; thus, as the

1 Cor. iii. 11. Apostle proclaims, "other foundation can no man lay but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus." But in Peter the truth thus irrevocably established St. Matt. xvi. 18. the prerogative of the Church: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church."'

Et ut brevis sententiæ claustello cuncta concludantur, frustra de fide Catholica inaniter gloriatur, qui dogma et regulam Sancti Petri non sectatur. Fundamentum quippe Ecclesiæ et firmamentum fidei, principaliter in Christo et sequenter in Petro collocatum, nequaquam ingruentibus tempestatum turbinibus nutabundum vacillabit, ita Apostolo promulgante: 1 Cor. iii. 11. *Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere præter id, quod positum est, quod est Jesus Christus. Petro* St. Matt. xvi. 18. *autem veritas ita privilegium sanxit Ecclesiæ: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.*

The true successors of St. Aldhelm.

Such at the close of the seventh century was the doctrine of the Church of England. Such was the teaching of St. Aldhelm, accounted, after his subsequent elevation to the episcopate, the first Bishop of Salisbury, though Sherborne was at that time the centre of the diocese.

Such in this nineteenth century, such, to the very letter, remains the doctrine of the one church in England which is in communion with the Apostolic See. Such, to the very letter, remains the teaching of those Roman Catholic Prelates, who now spiritually rule the territory which once was subject to the crosier of St. Aldhelm.

Is such the doctrine of the present so-called Church of England, many of whose members seek to prove her connection with the parent stock and stem she has deserted? Is such the teaching of the Anglican Prelate who now outwardly occupies St. Aldhelm's chair?

The effect of St. Aldhelm's efforts.

To his writings St. Aldhelm added fervent prayers, and the efforts of this man of God proved to a great extent successful. William of Malmesbury seems to intimate that they produced a lasting effect upon the whole nation of the British, although their prejudices would not allow them to acknowledge it.[1]

Hist. Eccl. v. 18.

St. Bede, as has been already mentioned, says that, through reading the book of St. Aldhelm, many of the Britons under the dominion of the West Saxons, were brought to conform to the Catholic method of computing the Paschal season. It does not appear whether it is to the same Britons or to others that St. Bede alludes, when, in a previous chapter, referring to the close of the sixth century or commencement of the seventh, he says, that 'at that time a great part of the Scots in Ireland, and *some also of the Britons in Britain*, received, by the gift of God, the proper and ecclesiastical time for observing Easter.' But the great mass of the British nation

Ibid. v. 15.

[1] He says:—'Debent usque hodie Britones correctionem suam Aldelmo; quamvis pro insitâ nequitiâ et virum non agnoscant et volumen pessum dederint.'—*Wilhelm. Malmes. de vitâ Aldhelmi Ep. Scireb. apud Wharton, Anglia Sacra*, tom. ii. p. 15.

who inhabited Wales, persisted obstinately in their own usage till late in the eighth century.

Remarkable coincidence.

The Scottish monks of Iona, as will be more fully related hereafter, were induced to conform to the general practice about the year 716. In recounting this event St. Bede takes occasion to observe, that it was plainly by a remarkable dispensation of divine goodness, that the nation who had freely and ungrudgingly preached to the English that knowledge of the divine truth which they possessed, should in return be instructed by the English on those points in which they themselves were deficient, and so arrive at the perfect rule of life. 'Whereas,' he adds, 'on the contrary, the Britons, who would not unfold to the English that knowledge which they had of the Christian faith, now that the people of the English believe and are fully instructed in the rule of the Catholic faith, still inveterate and falling short of its paths, both expose their own heads without a crown, and venerate the solemnities of Christ, unaccompanied by[1] the Church of Christ.

Hist. Eccl. v. 22.

[1] The literal rendering, '*without the society* of the church of Christ,' would be ambiguous, since the word *without* might be understood in the sense of *outside of*, whereas the sentence in the original is not, *extra* ecclesiam Christi, but, *sine* ecclesiæ Christi *societate*; meaning that, since the British Christians kept Easter at a different time from that observed by the universal church, they necessarily kept it at a time by themselves, and in that respect apart from the universal body. Again, when St. Bede speaks of the Britons as, 'falling short of,' or, 'deviating from,' the paths of the rule of faith—'*claudicantes a semitis suis*,' the expression must be interpreted by the context; which applies it to the

Sicut e contra Britones, qui nolebant Anglis eam, quam habebant, fidei Christianæ notitiam pandere, credentibus jam populis Anglorum et in regula fidei catholicæ per omnia instructis, ipsi adhuc inveterati et claudicantes a semitis suis, et capita sine corona prætendunt, et sollemnia Christi sine ecclesiæ Christi societate venerantur.

The Britons for the most part still adhered to their own customs. A.D. 731. Hist. Eccl. v. 23.

At the conclusion of his Ecclesiastical History, St. Bede gives a short account of 'the condition of the whole of Britain, about the year 285 of the coming of the Angles into Britain, but in the year 731 of the Lord's Incarnation.' He therein says, that 'the Britons for the most part, through national hatred, wrongly and by evil custom oppose the nation of the English,[1] and the appointed Pasch of the whole Catholic Church.' It was probably through the influence of their animosity to the Saxons, that,

questions of the tonsure and the computation of the Paschal season. Neither of these matters were points of doctrine. There are other passages in St. Bede's Ecclesiastical History, the sense of which might in the same way be mistaken unless they are examined with attention, and not merely read in a translation without the original being consulted.

[1] The Britons did not understand how the Saxons, as Christians, could continue in possession of the territories originally wrested by their ancestors from the British nation; whereas the Saxons, on the other hand, could not endure the pertinacity of the conquered Britons in still resisting them. Even St. Bede was not exempt from this national prejudice, which leads Monsieur de Montalembert to remark of that venerable historian, that 'like a thorough Englishman (*en véritable Anglais*),' he could not comprehend the sentiments of wounded patriotism, which rankled in the breasts of the victims of the Saxon invasion.—*Moines d'Occident*, t. v. p. 24.

The Britons of Wales at length conform, A.D. 770.

amongst all the Celtic Christians in Great Britain, the Britons of Wales were the last to conform to the then universal rules, regarding the manner of computing the Paschal period. This happy event occurred about the year 770, through the exertions of Elbod, who was at that time Archbishop of Bangor.

Welsh Saints, p. 66.

Rice Rees says that, 'Warrington, in his account of the church at the end of the History of Wales, states that Archbishop Elbod was appointed by the Pope;' and he adds, that, 'though the assertion is not supported by a reference to authority, the circumstance is by no means improbable.' If this could be proved to have been the case, it would afford still further testimony to the existence of visible intercommunion at that period, between Rome and the British church.

National records of the event.

The national annals which record the change in the time of keeping Easter, make no allusion whatever to the existence of any previous separation of the Britons from the Roman and universal church, notwithstanding the long-protracted divergence in custom; nor to any reconciliation of communion having taken place on the re-establishment of uniformity. Yet if there had been really any interruption of outward communion, in consequence of the Paschal controversy, an event so important as its restoration could hardly have been passed over in silence.

Apud Wharton, Angl. Sacr. t. ii. p. 648.

The 'Annals of the Church of Menevia,' record the change in the time of Easter as follows, under the year 770:—'The Pasch is changed amongst the Britons, being amended by Elbod, man of God.'

Anno DCCLXX. Pascha mutatur apud Britones, emendante Elbodu homine Dei.

In the *Brut y Tywysogion*, or Chronicle of the Princes of Wales, the same event is thus mentioned:—'Seven hundred and seventy was the year of Christ, when the Easter of the Britons was altered by the command of Elbot, a man of God.'

Monum. Hist. Brit. p. 843.

So again it is recorded with equal brevity in the 'Annals of Cambria,' under the year 768:—'The Pasch upon the Lord's Resurrection day is changed amongst the Britons, by the amendment of Elbodugus, a man of God.'

Ibid. p. 834.

Pasca commutatur apud Brittones, super Dominicam diem, emendante Elbodugo homine Dei.'

The change was gradual.

It could not, however, be expected that the alteration of a custom in favour of which popular prejudice was so largely enlisted, should be accomplished in one year throughout the whole of the Welsh territory. It is said that the year 777 was the date of the alteration in South Wales, and that it gave rise to a popular insurrection, in which the King was slain. The ancient records, quoted by Mons. Aug. Thierry, state also, that, 'in the year of Christ 809, died Elbod, Archbishop of the North, and the sun was eclipsed, and there were great dissensions amongst churchmen on account of the Pasch, because that the Archbishops of Menevia and Llandaff would not submit to the Archbishop of the North, a country at one time dependent on their spiritual authority.' This is the last occasion on which the differences upon this subject, are mentioned in the British

Aug. Thierry, Hist. de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands, ed. Furne, Paris, 1859, vol. i. pp. 81–83.

chronicles, and even in this case they appear to have been grounded on an objection to acknowledge the local jurisdiction of the See of Bangor.

Popular discontent at the adoption of a usage advocated by the Saxons.

The Roman and universal practice as to the computation of Easter, soon afterwards became universal amongst the clergy and religious in Britain,[1] though

[1] Rice Rees (Essay on Welsh Saints, p. 66, note *) gives the following extract from Hughes's Horæ Britannicæ:—'We find in the Greek life of St. Chrysostom, that certain clergymen, who dwelt in the isles of the ocean, repaired from the utmost borders of the habitable world to Constantinople, in the days of Methodius (who was patriarch there from the year 842 to 847), to enquire of *certain ecclesiastical traditions and the perfect and exact computation of Easter.* It is to be inferred from hence, as there can be no doubt that the British isles are referred to, that the disputes respecting Easter were not yet laid to rest, and that our Britons, not being satisfied with the determination of the Pope of Rome, resorted to the decision of the Bishop of Constantinople. (Vol. ii. p. 317.)'

If the passage above quoted by Hughes is to be depended upon as genuine, it may be replied that St. Methodius, the patriarch referred to, was warmly attached to the Roman See, and in full communion with the same; therefore the fact of the British clergy addressing themselves to him, would be an evidence of their own acknowledged communion with Rome and the universal church. They may have been in search of information which they considered would be most easily obtained at Constantinople; nor is there any evidence whatever to show that they were actuated by a spirit of opposition to Roman ecclesiastical authority, even supposing the above account to be accurate. It appears, however, to be doubtful how far it can be relied upon. It was evidently alluded to by Monsieur Augustin Thierry, in the early editions of his *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*, in the same page with the alleged bardic verse before mentioned (see above, p. 103 note); but there is no allusion whatever to it in his amended edition (Furne, Paris, 1859), in which the passage relating to the aforesaid verse is also sup-

their adoption of it gave rise to great popular discontent, which was fomented and increased by the influence of the bards. Newly fabricated verses were interpolated into the ancient poems, attributing the national disasters to the 'good understanding between the stranger, and monks traitors' to their country. These verses also denounced the monks as excommunicated, and expressed hopes that they might be punished as they deserved. The national prejudices were strong, and the passions of the ignorant populace were so violently aroused, that they levelled to the ground more than one of the monasteries situated near the English frontier, and partly peopled by Saxon monks.

Thus everything concurs to show, that the prolonged obstinate adherence of the Britons to their peculiar usages on certain points of ecclesiastical discipline, must in chief measure be attributed to their unwillingness to accept any reform from their detested Saxon conquerors.

Conclusion of this part of the investigation.

Throughout the present investigation, I have neither concealed nor passed unnoticed any circumstance, which seemed to militate against the opinion I have been maintaining. The cause of truth is not furthered by tricks of controversy, nor by a refusal to meet apparent difficulties. By evading such points, the narrative might have been rendered

pressed. Monsieur de la Villemarqué, who assisted Monsieur Aug. Thierry in the revision of this portion of his work, has informed me that the alteration was made, 'because the journey to Constantinople is as apocryphal as the verse of Taliessin;' or Cattawg, to whom it was assigned in Monsieur Aug. Thierry's reference.

more connected, and the reasoning more plausible, but the end in view would not have been attained. It cannot be denied that great obscurity hangs over the British history of that time, and that the little evidence which remains is broken and imperfect. Still, the concurrent testimony which has been adduced appears decidedly to tend to the conclusion, that the British Church of the period we have been considering, was never really separated from visible intercommunion with the Roman See and the universal body of the faithful. Notwithstanding the refusal of the Britons to accept St. Augustine as their archbishop, or to assist him in preaching to their Saxon foes, or to be on friendly terms even with the converted Saxons, or to alter their ancient customs, still the link does not appear to have been severed which united them to Rome and the rest of Christendom.

In any case it has been shown that there is no sufficient ground for the contrary assertion, and the smallest degree of uncertainty renders the instance unavailable as a precedent.

The interests in question are eternal! — What Christian would stake his immortal soul on the doubtful issue of a controverted point in history?

Supposing, however, that it could be proved that the British Christians of the period in question, were actually separated from the Roman and Universal Church, it would only show that they were in schism. It would not justify the position.

Explanation of the principal Celtic divergences in discipline.

Before entering more particularly on the subject of St. Aidan and the Scots, a few words of explanation are called for respecting the religious grounds of difference, between the Celtic churches of Great Britain in general, and the universal body of the faithful under Rome. None of the differences in question extended beyond matters of external discipline, and it does not seem necessary to refer to the minor points, such as variations in the liturgy, and the like. These did not occupy any prominent place in the controversy, which turned principally on the divergences respecting the time of Easter and the form of the clerical tonsure.

The Paschal controversy was undoubtedly of more serious practical moment than is commonly allowed by modern popular historians.

The points named by St. Augustine.

The only two points, in addition to the obvious duty of preaching to the English, respecting which St. Augustine required uniformity from the Britons, though without success, were the time of keeping Easter, and the manner of administering or completing baptism. It may be concluded, therefore, that these were the only two points of difference which he regarded as of consequence, and, as it has been said, See above, pp. 32, 33. these two points derived a greater degree of importance than they would otherwise have possessed, from the injurious effects which any difference respecting them might have been expected to produce upon the minds of the heathen whose conversion was St. Augustine's object, or on those of recent converts.

It is needless, as above said, to speak of any other points of divergence, since the fact that St. Augustine expressed his readiness to tolerate them all, makes it evident they were none of them important. The question of the tonsure forms the only exception, because of the prominence which it afterwards assumed.

Question concerning the administration of baptism.

The difference in the mode of the administration of baptism does not appear to have been of intrinsic importance. St. Bede does not allude to it again, nor is it mentioned, that I am aware of, by any other writer of the period, unless it gave rise to the concluding sentence in the chapter before quoted as from St. Theodore's collection. This circumstance confirms the view which has been taken, that the importance attributed to this point by St. Augustine was in connection with the mission to the Saxons. If the said difference had in any way affected the validity of the sacrament, it is impossible that it should not have given rise to further controversy. Since, on the contrary, it assumed no subsequent prominence, the subject may be dismissed with the observation that from the word (*compleatis*), which according to St. Bede was made use of by St. Augustine, it would appear that the divergence may have regarded the use of the chrism. St. Augustine's words, as given by St. Bede, were as follows :—'*ut ministerium baptizandi, quo Deo renascimur, juxta morem sanctæ Romanæ et Apostolicæ ecclesiæ compleatis.*' It has been conjectured that since con-

See above, p. 174.

Eccl. Hist. ii. 2.

firmation is sometimes called the *complement* of baptism, the word *compleatis* may have had reference to that sacrament; but St. Augustine seems to be speaking of baptism in itself, of which, according to the Roman rite, chrism is a most important though not essential adjunct, and it is remarkable that Archbishop Lanfranc in after years, is said to have reproached the Irish with the omission of the use of chrism, in the administration of the sacrament of baptism. Conjectures, however, are useless. We have no means of solving the difficulty with any certainty, and since this divergence does not appear to have affected the validity of the sacrament, or to have led to any subsequent division, it need not occupy our further attention.

Ussher, quoted by M. Varin, 2me Mémoire, p. 105.

The question of the form of the clerical tonsure was intrinsically of no importance, as is evident from the fact that it is not mentioned as having been even alluded to by St. Augustine in his interviews with the British bishops, but it was conceded by him amongst the points of divergence which he expressed his willingness to tolerate. Subsequently, however, it became a subject of serious contention between the Romanly instructed Saxon, and the Celtic churches, the former strongly asserting that the circular tonsure was instituted by St. Peter, and that the Celtic form had for its author that Apostle's opponent, Simon Magus. It has been seen that St. Aldhelm insisted on this argument, and a belief in its

Question of the form of the clerical tonsure.

historical truth was one of the popular errors amongst English churchmen at that period. It seems to have been generally if not universally received amongst them, though it had no foundation in reality.

Roman and Celtic tonsures.

However early may have been the origin of the clerical tonsure in itself, the form of the crown which at the period in question was used in Rome and amongst the Roman Saxons, and the institution of which was so unhesitatingly attributed by the same Saxons to St. Peter, does not appear to have commenced in the church before the latter part of the fifth century.[1] Nor was there any ground, on the other hand, for attributing the opposite form of the Celtic tonsure to Simon Magus, the opponent of St. Peter, although, as above said, it was universally done even by the best instructed of the said Saxons. The Celtic tonsure consisted in shaving the front part of the head from ear to ear, and it has been conjectured by Monsieur Varin, whose able writings on the whole subject have previously been mentioned, that the practice may have been derived from the ancient Druids, who are frequently called *Magi* by

2me Mémoire, p. 160.

[1] For fuller particulars, see Thomassin, Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina, p. i. lib. ii. cap. xxxvii. et seq. *De clericorum tonsura:* where he maintains that there was no discernible difference, either in tonsure or in dress, between the Christian clergy and laity during the first four or five centuries. See also *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, par M. l'Abbé Martigny, Paris, Hachette, 1865, *art.* Tonsure, and Goschler, *Dict. Encyc. de la Théol. Catholique*, *art.* Tonsure.

the early writers. M. Varin also states that the same form of tonsure still exists amongst the peasants of Brittany on the Continent.

The Paschal question.

The divergence respecting the computation of the time of Easter was of more serious moment, not only on account of the heresy which had existed on the subject in the East, but also because it regarded the observance of the queen of the church's festivals, which it especially behoves all Christians to celebrate in common; and by the date of which that of the other chief movable festivals is regulated. The difference, however, was by no means essential.

The popular argument that the mode of computing Easter then followed in Rome, and generally, had been decreed by the Council of Nicæa, was erroneous. It is true that the said Council had approved the practice at that time most general, and had asserted the principle that the Paschal festival ought always to be observed by all Christians on one and the same day without any difference. This had not, however, prevented notorious subsequent divergence even between the churches of Rome and Alexandria as to their time of the observance of Easter; a fact which of itself might well be pleaded as an excuse for the existence of a similar divergence, in the case of the far-distant churches of Great Britain.

The question in itself did not involve any point of doctrine, and, as has been before observed, whatever may have been the ardour of many of the Saxon

clergy on the subject, the See of Rome was indulgent and forbearing, allowing time for the establishment of uniformity, without the adoption of any extreme measures. Nor is there a single instance on record of any Celtic Christian who, on account of this divergence, was regarded as cut off from communion with Rome, though such pertinacity on the part of the Celtic churches cannot certainly be excused from fault if they were fully aware of the circumstances, which may reasonably be doubted.

The rule followed by the Celts came originally from Rome.

The highest authorities,[1] Protestant as well as Catholic, are agreed that the rule followed by the Celts in their computation of the Paschal season was the same with that which they had originally received from Rome. Their error consisted in their unwillingness to adopt the reforms by which that method of calculation had been amended. At first they may have been in ignorance of it, but latterly they appear to have been obstinately opposed to the change, through their national prejudices and their veneration for the holy men amongst their ancestors, who had followed the same practice.

Testimony to the ancient observance of the Roman Easter

It is stated in the life of St. Augustine of Canterbury, written in the twelfth century by Gotselinus or Jocelyn, a monk of St. Augustine's abbey, that on the

[1] It may suffice to give the names of Ussher, Prideaux, Bingham, and Smith the annotator on St. Bede, as well as those of Lingard, Lanigan, Varin, the Bollandist Fathers, and De Rossi; all of whom maintain that the rule followed by the Celts was none other than the ancient Roman rule.

occasion of St. Augustine's conference with the British bishops, the latter appealed to the authority of Pope Eleutherius, their first instructor, as well as to that of their own holy fathers, in behalf of their method of keeping Easter, and other peculiarities, which they said they ought not to change at the request of new dogmatizers. *Auctorizabant suas cerimonias, non solum a sancto Eleutherio Papa primo institutore suo, ab ipsa pene infantia Ecclesiæ, dictatas; verum a sanctis Patribus suis, Dei amicis et Apostolorum sequacibus, hactenus observatas, quas non deberent mutare propter novos dogmatistas.*

by the British church.

Bolland. Act. SS. 26 Maii. Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened. t. i. p. 507, n. 32.

The names of British prelates, as has been already stated, are found amongst those attached to the Acts of the Council of Arles (A.D. 314), the first canon of which decreed that Easter should everywhere be kept at one time and on one day, and requested Pope St. Sylvester to address letters to all upon the subject according to custom. *Primo loco de observatione Paschæ Dominici, ut uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem a nobis observetur, et juxta consuetudinem litteras ad omnes tu dirigas.* The *tu* here designates the Pope, St. Sylvester. Monsieur de Rossi in the course of his learned remarks on the Paschal computation, mentions the existence of an ancient Paschal table, which contains the dates of the Paschal time subsequently indicated every year by St. Sylvester; and he says further that these dates are found to be calculated according to the same cycle which, during the seventh century, and

Council of Arles.

Hard. Act. Concil. t. i. coll. 261–267.

Inscriptiones Christianæ, Romæ, 1857–1861, vol. i. Prolegomena, pp. lxxxv., lxxxvi.

some part of the eighth, was so tenaciously adhered to in the Celtic churches.

Britain kept Easter with Rome at the time of the Nicene Synod.

We are in possession of irrefutable testimony that at the time of the Council of Nicæa, the British Church kept Easter in perfect conformity with Rome and the greater part of the churches throughout the world. The synod decreed that the same custom should for the future be universally observed.

Letter of the Emperor Constantine concerning Easter. Theod. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. cap. 10. Euseb. de Vita Constantini, lib. iii. cap. 18, 19.

The letter from the Emperor Constantine which has been already alluded to, and which is addressed to the Bishops who were not present at the Nicene Synod, concerning what was there decreed, treats principally of the Paschal controversy. This document expressly mentions Britain as amongst the countries which then observed Easter at the same period with Rome, and as the context displays the spirit which actuated the Council in its conduct as regards this question, I shall extract the passage at length. The two principal objects aimed at by the Council were the avoidance of the Jewish observance of the feast, and the attainment of uniformity. After dwelling on the evils of judaizing, the Emperor proceeds :—

'It is further to be considered that in a matter of so great moment, and a feast of such religious solemnity, it is not lawful that dissension should exist. For our Saviour delivered to us one day of our liberation, that is of the most holy passion, and He willed that His Catholic Church should be one, whose members, although dispersed through various places, are still cherished in common by one spirit, that is by the will of God. But let the prudence of your

holiness reflect how serious and unbecoming it is that on the self-same days some indeed should be intent upon fasting, but others should be uniting in festivities; and that, after the days of the Pasch, some should be passing their time in feasts and recreations, but others should be giving themselves up to appointed fasts. Wherefore the Divine providence desires that this should be becomingly corrected, and be brought to one and the same form, as I think you all perceive. Since then it is fitting that this should be thus amended, so that there should be nothing in common between us and the practice of those parricides and slayers of the Lord; and since the rule which is observed by all the churches of the Western, Southern, and Northern parts of the world, and in certain places also in the East, is extremely fitting, all present judged that it would be just and right, and I myself undertook that it would be pleasing to your prudence, that the rule which is followed by one unanimous accord in the City of Rome, and throughout Italy, and all Africa, Egypt, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Libya, and the whole of Greece, through the Asian and Pontic diocese, and Cilicia, should be also willingly received by your prudence, considering that not only is the number of the churches greater in the aforesaid places, but also that it is most just that all should in common desire that which accurate reason shows to be required, and that there should be no fellowship with the perjury of the Jews. But that I should mention in sum the chief point, it was pleasing to the common judgment of all that the most holy feast of the Pasch should be celebrated on one and the same day. For it is not becoming that on so great a solemnity there should be any difference, and it is more fitting to follow that opinion in which there is no association with alien error and sin.'

After the above-mentioned decision of the Nicene Synod, the practice of observing Easter at the same period with the Jewish Passover was entirely ban-

ished from every part of the whole Catholic Church, and became the characteristic of the heresy of the Quartodecimans. Moreover, with the exception of a slight deviation which will be mentioned, on the part of the Latins, uniformity was for ever established as to the period at which Easter should be observed; it being decreed that the Roman and general usage should be universally followed, according to which Easter was kept on the Sunday first ensuing after the 14th moon of the vernal equinox. The few Eastern churches which had persevered in a different practice up to the period of the Nicene Council, acquiesced in its decree and conformed to the general custom.

Uniformity in principle; divergence in practice.

But though uniformity in principle was thus satisfactorily established, there existed for a long time a difference as to its practical application. The Latins, as we are informed by Victorius in his preface on the Paschal feast, followed the custom of never celebrating the festival of the Resurrection on any Sunday previous to the 16th; not esteeming it meet that the Passion of our Lord should be kept on any day prior to the date of the Jewish Passover, which always fell upon the 14th. The Alexandrians, on the contrary, kept the Passion on the 13th, and Easter on the 15th moon, whenever the 15th fell upon a Sunday. But all were agreed that it could not be kept earlier, lest it should be confounded with the Jewish Passover.

Apud Petav. de doct. temp. ii. p. 504. Ed. Antwerp. 1705.

Another discrepancy arose out of the different methods of calculation adopted, for determining the return of the period at which all were agreed that

Easter should be kept. It does not appear that the Council of Nicæa issued any decree upon this point. The opponents of the Celtic usages were justified in their appeal to the authority of the Nicene Synod so far as regarded the duty of uniformity, but there was no ground for their assertion that the venerable fathers in that Council had issued any decree respecting the astronomical calculation, by which the Easter period was to be determined. It would also appear that St. Cyril of Alexandria was misled by popular report when he stated, as has been already noticed, that the Council committed the charge of the astronomical calculations of the Easter season to the Church of Alexandria. For it is an historical fact that the churches of Rome and Alexandria, even during the period immediately following the Council of Nicæa, differed both respecting the date by which the Paschal moon itself should be determined; and also respecting the calculation of the days of the said moon. The Romans continued to calculate the Easter period after the ancient cycle of eighty-four years, which St. Bede states to have been the computation so pertinaciously adhered to by the Britons. The Alexandrians, on the other hand, followed the more exact cycle of nineteen years, which St. Aldhelm told the Britons was the rule established at Nicæa, whereas it was not adopted in Rome until about the middle of the sixth century. The circumstances that ensued in consequence of these early discrepancies, have been summed up by Dr. Lanigan in the following

See vol. i. p. 224.

Different calculations of Rome and Alexandria.

Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, pp. 374, 375.

Hist. Eccl. ii. 2.

Ep. ad. Geruntium. Vide supra, p. 189.

Vol. ii. pp. 376, 377. passage, which I extract from his 'Ecclesiastical History of Ireland':—

Ancient divergences as to the time of Easter.

'Considering this diversity of principles and rules, it is not to be wondered at, that serious questions occurred now and then concerning the time proper for the Paschal solemnity. In the year 387 it was celebrated at Rome on the 18th of April, and at Alexandria on the 25th, on which day it was kept also by St. Ambrose in his church of Milan, as he preferred the Alexandrine computation to that of the Romans. In 417 Easter day fell at Rome on the 25th of March, and at Alexandria on the 22nd of April. Without searching for further instances, two important discussions occurred during the pontificate of Leo the Great, one relative to the Paschal time of the year 444, and the other to that of 455. As to the former, the Roman calculation differed by nearly a month from the Alexandrine. The Pope having consulted, on this occasion, Cyril of Alexandria and Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybacum, in Sicily, was induced by them to order the celebration of Easter on the 23rd of April, the day marked by the Alexandrines. The second discussion was not so easily brought to a close, yet, for the sake of peace, Leo, although not fully convinced by the arguments of Proterius, Bishop of Alexandria, joined him in affixing the festival for that year to the 24th of April. To obviate these inconveniences it was deemed advisable to form a new Paschal cycle. That of 84 years continued at Rome down to, at least, 457, when there appeared that of 532 years, drawn up by Victorius of Aquitaine, concerning which let it suffice to observe, that although it brought matters nearer to the Alexandrine computations than the other, yet it differed from them in several respects, so as to leave room for further disputes. Nor was there a final stop put to this controversy between the Romans and the Alexandrines until about the middle of the sixth century, when the former adopted the cycle by Dionysius

Exiguus about 525, and which agreed with the Alexandrine method and rules. Yet this cycle was not received in several parts of the Western church as early as at Rome. A difference concerning the Paschal time existed in France down to not only the year 590, but to a later period, owing to the cycle of Victorius being still followed in some churches.'

Outward communion was not interrupted

Now it is notorious that, during the whole of the period above referred to, these differences did not give rise to any interruption of outward communion between the churches of Rome, Milan, Alexandria, and France. There is no reason therefore for supposing that a similar discrepancy should have involved any such separation in the case of the Celtic churches, particularly since it is expressly stated by St. Bede, as has been said, that the error of the Britons (in which the other Celtic churches shared) consisted in their adherence to the ancient cycle which had so long been made use of in Rome:—'They did not,' he says, 'keep the Lord's day of the Pasch at the proper time, but from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon; which computation is contained in a cycle of eighty-four years.'

Hist. Eccl. ii. 2.

Instance of British conformity with Rome.

We have unquestionable evidence that about the middle of the fifth century, the time of the British observance of Easter was regulated by the Church of Rome; for, as has been already stated, when Pope St. Leo altered the time of Easter to suit the Alexandrian computation in the year 455, on the occasion referred to by Dr. Lanigan, it is recorded in the Cambrian Annals that Easter was likewise changed in

See above, p. 43.

Britain, although through an error, the date assigned is A.D. 453. Under that year it is recorded, in somewhat barbarous Latin :—'The Pasch on the Lord's day is changed in accordance with Pope Leo, the Bishop of Rome.'

Annales Cambriæ, inter Monum. Hist. Britann. p. 830.

Pasca commutatur super diem Dominicum[1] *cum papa Leone episcopo Romæ.*

Why the Celts kept Easter on the 14th, if a Sunday.

Amongst the other reforms which the Romans effected in their computation of the Paschal season, they discontinued the practice of never keeping Easter on any Sunday earlier than the 16th moon, and they admitted the 15th as fitted for that purpose. But the Celts, as has been said, kept it as early as the 14th moon if such happened to be a Sunday. At first sight this would appear to be an irreconcilable discrepancy. It has, however, been discovered upon investigation, that this Celtic peculiarity was in all probability a continuation of the previous mistake in the Roman computation, so that it furnishes another proof of the uniformity between the Celtic and the ancient Roman practice. In the above-quoted epistle of St. Aldhelm to King Geruntius, it is mentioned that the Britons followed the rule of Sulpitius Severus, and the learned Protestant Archbishop Ussher sees reasons for believing, that owing to the

See above, p. 189.

Britann. Eccl. Ant. cap. xvii.

[1] This expression might be liable to misconstruction, if we were not rendered certain by history that it could not mean '*to* the Lord's day' (*in* Dominicum diem). There can be no question that the Celtic churches always kept Easter on the Sunday, and were so far in accordance with the Roman and universal rule.

defect of the cycle, the day called the 16th had come to be only in reality the 14th, and that Sulpitius Severus, in order to rectify the error, called it what it was, the 14th. Dr. Lanigan has so clearly explained this point, on the authority of Ussher to whom he refers, that I again make use of his words. He says:—

Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. ii. pp. 383, 384.

How the 16th became the 14th.

'To understand the origin of this difference, it must be recollected that, owing to the incorrectness of the cycle of 84 years followed at Rome, a palpable mistake, which could be discovered merely by eyesight, had crept into the Roman mode of reckoning the days of the moon. In the early part of the fifth century it had come to such a pitch that what was really only the first day was called at Rome the third, and what was only the 14th was called the 16th. Sulpitius Severus, who lived at this period, having undertaken the revisal of the cycle of 84 years, and observing that the day called the 16th, on which, according to the Roman method, Easter could be celebrated, was, correctly speaking, the 14th, thought it absurd to go on calling it the 16th. Accordingly he gave it the name of 14th, and laid down as a rule, that, as it was in reality the same day as the 16th of the former edition of the cycle, Easter Sunday might fall on the 14th, but not earlier. St. Patrick, who was undoubtedly acquainted with Sulpitius Severus, and followed the Gallican practices, such as were observed at Tours, Auxerre, &c., brought this reformed cycle and its rules to Ireland, where it was observed without any dispute until the arrival of the Roman missionaries in Britain. From Ireland it passed into the parts of North Britain possessed by the Scots and Picts, in consequence of its having been adhered to by Columbkill and his disciples. The Britons also adopted it, not indeed as strictly speaking a new cycle different from the old Roman, which they had

followed from the beginning, but as a more correct and rational edition of it.'

Thus, as Dr. Lanigan further observes, if the Romans had not been in the habit of calling by the name of the 16th that which was really only the 14th, the first Paschal day of the Irish canon would have been called the 16th. The same would also have been the case with the Britons and the Scots.

Conclusion respecting the Paschal question.

It is evident from what has been said that the Celtic computation of Easter was in perfect accordance with the Roman, so far down as the latter part of the fifth century; but the isolated position of the Celts, and, as regards Britain, their struggles for national existence which absorbed every thought, appear to have prevented them from afterwards introducing, if not to have entirely kept them in ignorance of, the reforms subsequently adopted at Rome. Hence, in the seventh century, when the Roman missionaries and their Saxon disciples, endeavoured to persuade the Celtic churches to abandon their ancient rule of the Paschal computation, and to conform to the subsequently adopted method, the Celts were startled and alarmed at the novelty, and it was only by slow degrees that, through deference to the See of Rome and to the customs of the universal church, they were finally prevailed upon to consent. The veneration which they entertained for the great Saints amongst their ancestors who had practised the ancient rule, formed one of the principal objections to the innovation throughout all the churches of the

Celts; and in Britain this was heightened and intensified by the national hatred so universally entertained towards the Saxons. Besides their habitual unwillingness to make any change, they could not brook to receive so important an ecclesiastical reform from the hands of their Saxon conquerors, or to abandon at their exhortation an ancient custom of their forefathers, which they well knew from tradition had originally been received by them from Rome. Adherence to their ancient usages was a mark of their independence which they were naturally reluctant to lay aside.

In fact, it was only through external and accidental circumstances, not through any want of allegiance to Rome and the Catholic church, that the Celtic were the last amongst Christian churches to accept the reformed method of the Paschal computation. The Britons were later than all the others in adopting it, owing to their peculiar and inveterate hostility to the Saxons.

The ecclesiastical position of the Scots and Picts.

It has been seen that, in spite of the efforts and solicitations of St. Augustine, the British Christians would not consent to assist in preaching the gospel to their Saxon enemies; and that, from first to last, they had no part or share in the great work of the conversion of the English people. It cannot therefore be to the British church, properly so called, that Dr. Pusey's remark should be applied, when he says:—

Vide supra, p. 6. 'Our own heathen ancestors, in our St. Augustine's time, were in great measure converted by those who were not in communion with Rome, yet God blessed the zeal of both for His glory.'

Ibid. So also as regards the observation of Dr. Forbes, who says:—'Subjective unity was suspended in the quarrels between the British and Western churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of St. Aidan or St. Cuthbert.' This remark cannot be applied to the church of the ancient British nation, for St. Aidan belonged altogether to the Scots or Irish, and though it is uncertain whether St. Cuthbert was Celt or Saxon by birth, he belonged originally to the Scottish church.

Scottish mission. It was from the great Scottish, or, as we should now say, Irish monastery of Iona, not, indeed, in our St. Augustine's time, but thirty years after his decease, that those ardent missionaries came forth, who completed the glorious work which St. Augustine had so successfully commenced. St. Aidan was the leader of these noble labourers in the field of Christ, and he must be regarded as the second apostle of the great kingdom of Northumbria. The Roman St. Paulinus was the first to preach and baptize in that region, but he had been compelled to fly, through the triumph of the cruel British Cadwalla and the heathen Mercian Penda, over his patron King Edwin who was slain in battle against them. The kingdom was again threatened by, and in great measure enveloped in, pagan darkness, when the Scottish mis-

sionaries were sent, at the request of King Oswald, to rekindle the light of the true and saving faith. After the days of St. Aidan their work of love extended far and wide through other provinces of England, and to these Irish missionaries are we indebted for the completion of the work of England's conversion after the Saxon invasion, which had been originally commenced by Rome. It was not that the Roman mission whose centre was at Canterbury, had been suspended, nor was it superseded by the mission of the Scots; but it did not by any means cover the whole of the Saxon territory, and the Scotch or rather Irish fellow-labourers with the Roman missionaries, were called by the providence of God into those portions of the vineyard which at that time were unoccupied by the Romans.

One of England's obligations to Ireland.

This is one of the many unknown or unacknowledged debts of gratitude which our country owes to Ireland; for though scarcely remembered it is a historical fact, that to Ireland, after Rome, our English ancestors were indebted for the knowledge of Christ's gospel, and the saving graces of His sacraments.

St. Cuthbert did not belong to the first missionary period. He was one of the chief reapers in the abundant harvest of which others had sown the seeds.

It is my present object to show, in the case of the Christian Scottish Celts, as I have endeavoured to

show in the case of the British, that notwithstanding their divergences respecting the observance of Easter and other points of discipline, they were not cut off or separated from visible and acknowledged communion with Rome, throughout the whole of the period in question; and in particular that both St. Aidan and St. Cuthbert were alike, in life and death, honoured and revered for their sanctity by the whole body of the faithful in undoubted communion with the Roman See.

The Picts did not take so prominent a part as the Scots, in the missionary work of England. They were however followers of the Celtic customs, and I therefore include them in the same category with the Scots, and treat of the two nations together.

The monks of Iona.

Before entering upon the subject in further detail it should be observed, that the great monastery of Iona was at one and the same time the source and centre of all the missionary efforts of the Scots amongst the Saxons, and also the principal and most unyielding stronghold amongst all the Irish Christians, whether in Ireland itself or in Caledonia, of the ancient Celtic usages. Its inmates adhered to those then peculiar customs with so strong a pertinacity, as to be exceeded only by the Britons of Cambria. The Britons were some sixty years after the Scots in their acceptance of the reformed computation of the Paschal period, but the Scots held to the old system as late as the year 715. They did so in spite of the exhortations of one of their own

abbots, St. Adamnan, who had himself been induced to accept the generally received reforms, but who did not succeed in his efforts to convince his monks of the reasonableness and the duty of such conformity. Their defective rule for the calculation of the Easter season, was so hallowed in their eyes by the fact that it had come down to them through a long line of saintly ancestors, and especially through their own venerated founder, St. Columba, that they clung to it with all the unreasoning affection of the heart. When at length they were persuaded to adopt the new style, which had then been followed for so long a time by Rome and the church in general (though the Scotch monks, in their distant dwelling, had but few means of knowing it), it was not at the voice of anyone of their own nation. This important change was the result of the personal influence and exhortations of an English priest, who had passed a considerable part of his life in Ireland, and who came from that country to the monastery of Iona, where he happily ended his days, as will be hereafter more fully related.

Iona was identical with the Scots.

The monastery of Iona may therefore be regarded as the representative of the Celtic party in the North, and to that institution the remarks of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes have consequently a special application. It may be well then, before proceeding further, to ascertain whether the view which these writers have so positively put forth, is confirmed by contemporary authority in the case of the monks of Iona, who

formed, as has been said, the very nucleus and centre of the Celtic party, as well as of the Scottish missions to our ancestors.

St. Bede's account of the Monks of Iona.

Our venerable historian, the holy Bede, was a thorough Saxon and a thorough Roman Catholic. He had no bias in favour of the Celtic race, and he held the Celtic peculiarities in abomination. Devoted as he was to the See of Rome and dutiful to the voice of the universal church, he would hold in horror, and regard as a schismatic, any Christian who was separated from visible Roman Catholic communion. His ecclesiastical history is the highest authority we possess upon the subject, and if the monks of Iona had been outwardly divided from the communion of Rome and the universal church, he would certainly have recorded so important a circumstance in its pages. The opinion which St. Bede entertained of the said monks may be learnt from several passages of his history. In one of these he tells how St. Columba, after founding a monastery in Ireland, came into Britain, thirty-two years before he died, and there founded the monastery of Iona, from which sprang many others, raised up by his disciples both in Britain and in Ireland; but that of Iona, adds St. Bede, where his body reposed, held rule over them all. St. Bede also mentions some writings concerning the life and sayings of St. Columba, said to have been in the possession of his disciples; after which he proceeds:—

Hist. Eccl. iii. 4.

Ibid.

'But whatever he was himself, we hold this for certain

concerning him, that he left successors distinguished by great continency, and by love of God, and by their monastic rule; following indeed doubtful cycles at the time of the chief festival, as men placed far beyond the world, to whom no one had communicated the synodical decrees respecting the observance of Easter; only diligently following those works of piety and chastity which they could learn in the prophetical, evangelical, and apostolic writings. But this kind of observance of Easter continued amongst them no little time, that is, for a hundred and fifty years, even till the year 715 of the Lord's Incarnation.

'But then there came to them the most reverend and most holy father and priest Egbert, of the nation of the English, who for a long time had lived as an exile in Ireland for the sake of Christ, and who was most learned in the Scriptures and excellent in the perfection of a long life; and through him they were corrected and brought over to the true and canonical day of Easter, which yet they did not before celebrate always on the fourteenth moon with the Jews, as some supposed,[1] but indeed on the Lord's day, though in a different week than was proper. For they knew as Christians, that the Lord's resurrection, which took place on the first day of the week, was always to be celebrated on the first day of the week; but as outlandish and simple (*barbari et rustici*), they had by no means learned when the same first day of the week, which is now called the Lord's day, should come. But because they did not cease to burn with the grace of charity, they also merited to receive the full knowledge of this matter in perfection, according to the apostle, who says: "And if in anything you be otherwise minded; this also God will reveal to you." Fuller mention of which will be made hereafter in the proper place.' Phil. iii. 15.

St. Columba is commemorated in the Roman

[1] This appears to apply to Eddius. See above p. 159, where this passage is referred to.

martyrology on the 9th of June, which in itself is an evident proof that he belonged to the Roman communion, as I have shown when before treating of St. Meletius.

See Vol. I. pp. 337, &c.

Importance of St. Bede's language.

As regards his successors, it is inconceivable that St. Bede should have spoken of them, as he has done in the passage above quoted, if he had looked upon them as outwardly separated from the visible communion of the Roman and universal church. The general tenor of his language is contrary to any such supposition, and in particular the manner in which he mentions and excuses their defective practice respecting Easter. As has been already observed, an outward separation from Rome and the church throughout the world, would undoubtedly, in the eyes of St. Bede, as in those of Roman Catholics now and in all ages, have involved nothing less than schism; and it cannot be believed that St. Bede would have remarked concerning persons whom he regarded as schismatics, that, 'because they had not ceased to burn with the grace of charity, they merited to receive full knowledge' respecting the proper time of Easter. *Verum quia gratia caritatis fervere non omiserunt, et hujus quoque rei notitiam ad perfectum percipere meruerunt.*

It is further to be observed, that he does not speak of them as having had occasion to be reunited to the church, on their acceptance of the Catholic computation of Easter, but simply as having been happily

brought into conformity with the general usage on an important point of discipline.

St. Aidan was sent from the monastery of Iona. Hist. Eccl. iii. 5.

St. Bede commences the chapter immediately following the above extract, in these words:—'From this island then, from the community of these monks was sent forth Aidan, after receiving the rank of the episcopate, to instruct the province of the Angles in Christ.' The remaining portion of the chapter is filled with a recital of the apostolic virtues and discretion of St. Aidan. But before treating more particularly of this holy servant of God, and of his great patron St. Oswald, King of Northumbria, I will briefly recount the circumstances which gave rise to the Scottish mission in that kingdom, as they are related in the history of St. Bede.

Origin of the Scottish mission. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. Gent. Angl. lib. ii. c. 12; iii. c. 1.

Ethelfrid, the warlike King of Northumbria, having been defeated and slain (A.D. 617) by the forces of Redwald, King of East Anglia, the exiled Edwin succeeded to his throne. During the whole period of Edwin's reign, Eanfrid and Oswald, two sons of the aforesaid King Ethelfrid, together 'with many young men of the nobility, lived in banishment amongst the Scots or Picts, and were there instructed according to the doctrine of the Scots, and regenerated by the grace of baptism.'

King Edwin's marriage. Ibid. ii. 9.

In the year 625, King Edwin, though still a Pagan, was wedded to the Christian Ethelberge, daughter of Ethelbert, King of Kent. She was not granted to

him by her father till Edwin had guaranteed to herself and to all who came with her, full freedom in the practice of their religion; and he did not refuse to accept the same religion as his own, if it should be found on examination to be more holy and more worthy of God. Ethelberge was accompanied by Paulinus, after he had been consecrated bishop by Archbishop Justus of Canterbury, on the 21st of July in the same year.

King Edwin's conversion. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. ii. 9, 10, 12.

Paulinus strove in various ways to induce King Edwin to embrace the Christian faith, and Pope Boniface addressed to him an epistle containing a similar exhortation. The new Queen's happy delivery of a daughter, the King's preservation from an assassin's dagger, his victory over the hostile King by whom the assassin had been sent, all combined to move his heart. He had consented to his daughter's baptism. She was the first baptized, says St. Bede, of the nation of the Northumbrians, with twelve others of her family, on the feast of Pentecost, A.D. 627. He had given this child to Paulinus for Christ in earnest of a promise which he at the same time made, that, if victorious over his above-named enemy, he would himself embrace the Christian religion. But still he hesitated, seeking to learn more from St. Paulinus respecting the grounds of faith, and to confer with the wisest of his own nation.

He would sit for hours alone, deliberating upon the subject, till one day St. Paulinus drawing near, laid

his right hand upon his head, and asked him if he recognised that sign.

His vision.

In former years Edwin, then an exile and in danger, was seated sad and mournful outside the palace gate of Redwald, from whom, although his host, he dreaded treachery. There, in the stillness of the night, he was musing over his misfortunes, when suddenly there drew near to him, a stranger, whose appearance was unknown, and whose unexpected approach filled Edwin with alarm. The stranger saluted him, and after disclosing a knowledge of his troubles, asked what reward he would bestow on one who would not only deliver him from present dangers, but would further assure him of victory over his enemies, and of a reign more glorious than that of all who had ever reigned over the nation of the English. When Edwin promised a suitable return for such great favours, the stranger further enquired whether he would be content to follow the advice of the same person, if he could offer him better and more useful counsel for his life and his salvation than any of his friends or relatives had ever heard of. Edwin promised compliance under such circumstances; and the stranger, then laying his hand upon his head, bade him to recognise that token when it should be given him hereafter.

Its results.

Years had fled since then; and the conditions had been fulfilled. Edwin had not only been delivered from exile and from danger, but he was now reigning gloriously and in unwonted power. Thus, when the

holy Bishop Paulinus drew near to him with that mysterious token, the past flashed full upon the soul of the astonished King, who, all trembling, was about to cast himself at the feet of the man of God. Paulinus raised him up, and in a familiar tone reminded him how, by the help of God, he had escaped the enemies he feared; how, by His gift, he had obtained the kingdom he desired. He exhorted him no longer to delay, but to embrace the faith of Him Who had bestowed these temporal blessings on him, and Who would, if Edwin proved obedient to His will, deliver him also from eternal torments, and make him partaker of His heavenly and everlasting kingdom. The King replied that he was willing and in duty bound to accept the faith which Paulinus taught, but that he would confer about the matter with the princes his friends and counsellors, so that if they came to the same mind, they all might be baptized together.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. ii. 13, 14.

Paulinus having consented, the assembly was convened, and it resulted in the conversion of the leaders of the nation. The pagan high priest, Coifi, was foremost in proclaiming his adherence to Christ's truth, and his renunciation of the false idols. He immediately proceeded publicly to profane the heathen temple with the altars which he himself had consecrated, and he commanded his companions to destroy and burn the building, with all its enclosures.

Baptism of King Edwin and his nobles and people. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. ii. 14.

Thus it came to pass that, in less than two years after his marriage with the Christian Ethelberge, 'King Edwin, with all the nobles of his nation, and

very many of the people, received the faith, and the washing of holy regeneration, in the eleventh year of his reign, which is the year of the Lord's incarnation, 627,' on the holy festival of Easter, which, in that year, fell on the 12th of April.

This happy event took place at York, in the church of St. Peter the Apostle, which the King had built of wood whilst under preparation for baptism. St. Paulinus became the first bishop of York, and by his advice King Edwin commenced a nobler and more spacious basilica of stone, which included within its walls the former oratory; but he did not live to complete it.

St. Paulinus baptizes in the rivers Glen and Swale.

During the six years which elapsed between the baptism and death of King Edwin, St. Paulinus was actively engaged in preaching and baptizing in both provinces of the kingdom of Northumbria. St. Bede says it was reported that on one occasion, when he accompanied the King and Queen to their country seat of Adgefrin, in the province of Bernicia (now Yeverin in Glendale, near Wooler in Northumberland), 'he remained with them thirty-six days, occupied in the office of catechizing and baptizing; during the whole of which time, from morning till evening, he employed himself in nothing else but in instructing the people who flocked to him from all villages and places, in the word of Christ's salvation; and in washing them, when instructed, in the bath of forgiveness in the river Glen, which was near at hand.' He also stayed frequently with the King in the pro-

Bohn's translated edition, p. 97, note †.

vince of Deira, where he baptized in the river Swale, near Cataract, now Catterick, in Yorkshire.

King Edwin slain in battle. - Hist. Eccl. ii. 20.

But this good work was interrupted by what St. Bede, from his Saxon point of view, styles the rebellion of Cadwalla, King of the Britons, assisted by the heathen King Penda, of Mercia, against King Edwin, when Edwin had reigned seventeen years over both Angles and Britons, for six of which, as has been said, he had himself been a soldier of the kingdom of Christ. *At vero Edwinus cum decem et septem annis genti Anglorum simul et Britonum gloriosissime præesset, e quibus sex etiam ipse, ut diximus, Christi regno militavit, rebellavit adversus eum Cadwalla rex Britonum, auxilium præbente illi Penda viro strenuissimo de regio genere Merciorum.* A great battle occurred between them on the plain called Heathfield, on the 12th of October, in the year 633, in which King Edwin himself was slain, and the whole of his army was either destroyed or dispersed. King Edwin's head was carried to York, and afterwards placed in the church of St. Peter the Apostle, which he had begun, 'in the porch of the holy Pope Gregory, from whose disciples he had received the word of life.'

The barbarity of Cadwalla.

A great slaughter ensued in the church and the nation of the Northumbrians. Little better was to be expected from Penda, who was a worshipper of idols, together with all his people, and ignorant of the Christian name; but the British Cadwalla, though a Christian, was more barbarous and cruel than even the

pagan Penda. Cadwalla's nationality as a Briton had more power over him than his religion as a Christian, and heedless alike of the rise or the downfall of Christianity amongst the people he had conquered, he indiscriminately slaughtered all, and that with torture, sparing neither women nor children, but resolving to destroy the whole of the detested English race throughout the length and breadth of the island.

St. Paulinus and Queen Ethelberge return into Kent.

Such is the account given by St. Bede, and, even if it be considered necessary to make allowance for the over-colouring which Saxon prejudice may have added to the picture, it is evident from the conduct of St. Paulinus, that Cadwalla cannot have shown any regard to the protection or the future propagation of the Christian faith, amongst the people whom victory had for the time placed under his power. For St. Bede tells us that by reason of this slaughter the affairs of the Northumbrians were so disturbed, that there appeared to be no safety except in flight; and he says that Paulinus, taking with him Queen Ethelberge, whom he had formerly brought thither, returned by sea into Kent, where he was honourably received by Archbishop Honorius and King Eadbald.

The see of Rochester was at that time vacant, and at the request of the Archbishop and the King, St. Paulinus undertook the charge of the diocese, and maintained it till his death. St. Bede adds that he left there the pall which, as he also mentions in a

previous chapter, had been sent to him by the Pope.

St. Paulinus left James the deacon.

It is not, however, stated that Paulinus relinquished his former see of York, although dwelling elsewhere, and having charge of another diocese. In any case, he had been mindful not to leave its spiritual necessities entirely unprovided for. St. Bede informs us that he 'left behind him in his church of York, James the deacon, a man altogether ecclesiastical and holy, who, remaining a long time afterwards in the church, rescued much prey from the old enemy by teaching and baptizing; by whose name the village near Cataract, in which he was mostly accustomed to reside, is called even to this day.[1] Being most skilful in singing in the church, when peace after a while was restored in the province and the number of the faithful was increasing, he began to be also a master to many of ecclesiastical singing, after the manner of the Romans or Cantuarians; and when old and full of days, in the language of the Scriptures, he followed the way of his fathers.'

Hist. Eccl. ii. 20.

James the Deacon and the Scottish mission.

The restoration of peace and spread of religion above referred to by St. Bede, occurred during the period of the Scottish mission. Now James the deacon belonged to the Roman mission, and St.

[1] A foot note in Bohn's translated edition (p. 108), states that this village is near Richmond, in Yorkshire, and is now called Akeburgh. It is evident that the syllable *Ake* may readily have been derived from the Latin *Jacobus* for *James*; in French, *Jacques*.

Bede subsequently informs us that he adhered to and advocated the Roman computation of Easter. Yet we find him on friendly and intimate terms with the Scots, teaching them the ecclesiastical chant which was in use both in Rome and at Canterbury. He was still alive at the time of the Council of Whitby, in which St. Bede mentions that he was present, about thirty years after the flight of St. Paulinus.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

Successors to King Edwin. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl iii. 1.

The great kingdom of Northumbria was divided, as is well known, into two provinces, the northern of which was called Bernicia, and the southern Deira. These were not always united under one king. The family of Edwin belonged to the province of Deira, and there he first began to reign; but, as frequently happened with other rulers, he afterwards became monarch of the whole kingdom.

At his death, however, the two provinces were again divided.

The province of Deira passed to the rule of Osric, who was cousin to King Edwin, being a son of his paternal uncle Elfric. Osric had been converted to Christianity by the preaching of St. Paulinus.

The northern province, Bernicia, devolved upon Eanfrid, son of Ethelfrid the enemy of Edwin and his predecessor in the rule of the Northumbrian kingdom, who had been vanquished and slain in battle by King Redwald, the protector of Edwin. Ethelfrid's two sons, Eanfrid and Oswald, of whom Eanfrid was the eldest, had, as before mentioned, taken refuge amongst the Scots or Picts, where they lived in exile

during the whole of the reign of King Edwin. So soon as he was dead, they returned to their own country. During their exile they had been instructed in Christianity by their Celtic hosts, 'according to the doctrine,' says St. Bede, 'of the Scots'; meaning that, besides what was essential, they had been brought up in the Celtic peculiarities as to the time for observing Easter, and the rest. Whilst among the Celts, they had also been baptized.

Their miserable end.

Both these unhappy men, Osric, King of Deira, and Eanfrid of Bernicia, most shamefully apostatised from the faith on their attainment to their respective thrones, thus abandoning their heavenly kingdom on receiving an earthly one, and giving themselves up again, to be polluted and lost through their former abominable idolatry. The judgment of heaven immediately overtook them. Osric was the first who fell. He was slain during the following summer, in a sally made by the British Cadwalla from a town which Osric was besieging. St. Bede tells us that after this, Cadwalla held in possession the Northumbrian provinces for a whole year, not like a victorious king, but like a raging tyrant, who by cruel slaughter destroyed them and tore them in pieces. At length he slew also the wretched Eanfrid, King of Bernicia, who had unwisely gone to him with twelve chosen soldiers to ask for peace. 'To this day,' adds St. Bede, 'that year remains unfortunate and hateful in the eyes of all good men, as well on account of the apostasy of the

English kings, as on that of the savage tyranny of the British king. Wherefore it has been agreed by all who compute the dates of the kings, to abolish the memory of the perfidious kings, and to assign the year to the reign of the following king, Oswald, a man beloved by God.'

St. Oswald, King of Northumbria.

The Oswald thus spoken of was the younger brother of the slaughtered Eanfrid. Together with him he had been instructed and baptized by the Scots or Picts, amongst whom, as has been said, he had passed his early life, and whose constant friend he remained until his death. Through his influence the Scottish missionaries were introduced into England as soon as he had ascended the throne of Bernicia. He was the bosom friend and patron of St. Aidan, with whom, as his bishop, he was in closest ecclesiastical communion. No further proof need be required that that communion was Roman Catholic, than the warm and affectionate praises of St. Oswald of which the pages of St. Bede and others are so full, and the consequent commemoration of the holy king in the Roman martyrology. He was one of the most illustrious of our early English saints, and the good fame of his sanctity was not limited to our own isle. Yet in life and death he was bound up with the Celtic ecclesiastical communion.

St. Oswald's victory over Cadwalla. Hist. Eccl. iii. 1.

The kingdom of Bernicia having thus devolved upon Oswald, like another David he delayed not to attack the British invader and devastator Cadwalla. With an army small in numbers, but strong in his

faith in Christ, he boldly advanced against him, and, says St. Bede, 'the abominable leader of the Britons was slain, in spite of those immense forces of which he boasted as irresistible.'

The battle of Heavenfield. Hist. Eccl. iii. 2.

St. Bede relates that, before entering into the engagement, St. Oswald erected a wooden cross upon the battle-field, and besought God, on bended knees, that He would succour His worshippers in their urgent necessity. He says that, burning with faith, King Oswald himself placed the cross in the hole which had been prepared for it, and held it erect with both his hands whilst the soldiers filled in the earth around its base. When it was firmly fixed, he raised his voice and called aloud to the whole of his army, to kneel down and pray together to 'the living and true Almighty Lord, in His mercy to defend them from the proud and fierce enemy, for He knows,' he added, 'that we have undertaken this war for the just safety of our nation.' 'All,' proceeds our venerable historian, 'did as he commanded, and thus advancing against the enemy at the dawn of day, they gained the victory as his faith deserved. In whose place of prayer (*in cujus loco orationis*) innumerable miracles of healing are known to have been wrought, evidently as a sign and memorial of the King's faith. For, even to this day, many are wont to cut off chips from the very wood of the most sacred cross, which, being put into water, sick men or cattle are speedily restored to health, if they drink it, or are sprinkled with it.

St. Oswald's faith.

Commemoration of St. Oswald.

'In the language of the Angles that place is called Heavenfield, which name indeed it certainly received as a sure presage of future events; signifying certainly, that there a heavenly trophy would be erected, a heavenly victory commenced, and heavenly miracles there wrought, even to the present day. But the place is near that wall in the north, by which the Romans formerly, as we have said above, girded the whole of Britain from sea to sea, in order to repel the attacks of the barbarians. To which place, indeed, the brothers of the church of Hagulstad, which is not far distant, have now for a long time been in the practice of coming every year, the day before that on which the same King Oswald afterwards was slain, to keep vigils for the good of his soul; and after singing many psalms of praise, to offer up for him, in the early morn, the victim of the holy oblation. This good custom also increasing, and a church having been lately built there, they have made this place in every way more holy and more honourable than all others. Nor did it deserve any less; for, so far as we know, no mark of the Christian faith, no church, no altar was erected in all the nation of the Bernicians, before that the new leader of the army set up this standard of the holy cross, prompted by the devotion of his faith when about to combat against a most cruel enemy.'

The warm affection with which, in his simple manner, our great Catholic Saxon historian recounts these circumstances; the miracles he records as

wrought and looked for even in his own day, through the cross which Oswald had erected; the touching devotion which he describes of the pious monks of Hagulstad, or, as it is now called, Hexham—a monastery founded by St. Wilfrid himself, that ardent champion of the Roman cause—all proclaim and testify, that the Saxons counted Oswald as visibly and avowedly one in communion with Rome and with themselves, though he was inseparably blended with the Celtic church.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 2.

St. Bede proceeds to relate one of the many miracles that had been wrought through the same cross.

Instance of the miraculous virtue of St. Oswald's cross.

A brother of the above church of Hagulstad, or Hexham, who was alive at the time when St. Bede wrote the account, had fallen upon the ice, and severely injured his arm. It caused him intense pain; and hearing one morning that one of the brothers was about to go to the place where the holy cross of St. Oswald was, he begged of him to bring back a piece of 'that venerable wood,' saying that he believed, with the help of God, he might be healed through it. The brother to whom he made the request brought him, on his return, some of the old moss which grew on the surface of the wood, and gave it him whilst at table. The sufferer placed it in his bosom, and, in forgetfulness, there left it when he went to rest. He awoke in the night, and found his hand and arm completely healed.

These monks of St. Wilfrid's monastery must be

accounted as Roman in heart and soul, and none of them would have thus invoked St. Oswald's aid, if the Scottish communion to which that saint belonged, and in which from the hour of his baptism he lived and died, had been in a position of visible separation from Rome and the universal church.

St. Oswald and Cadwalla were both of them Celtic in their religion.

The above passage of history also, in some measure, corroborates the view which has been taken, that the differences between the Britons and the Saxons were rather national than religious in their character.

St. Oswald, though Saxon in race, was as Celtic in his ecclesiastical peculiarities as his deadly foe the British Cadwalla. Yet this circumstance does not appear in any degree to have mitigated their mutual hostility; and St. Oswald appealed to heaven against the British invader, though a follower of the same religious customs as those practised by his own Scottish instructors in the faith, and by himself. St. Bede, though an ardent advocate of the Roman Catholic customs, and most severe in his language towards the Britons, is filled with love and admiration of St. Oswald, the disciple, friend, and patron of the Scottish Celtic Christians, whose divergences from the Roman and general practice, as to Easter and the tonsure, were identical with those of the Britons.

St. Oswald applies to the Scotch for missionaries. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

Amongst the earliest of the thoughts and desires of the pious Oswald, after he had ascended the throne of Bernicia, was the wish that the whole of his people should receive the knowledge and grace of the

Christian faith. In order to attain this happy end, he naturally looked for assistance to the neighbouring churches of the Scots, from whom he had himself received baptism, amongst whom he had afterwards passed the whole of his Christian life, and whose missionary success had formerly been so great amongst the adjoining people of Caledonia. He accordingly sent messengers to them, requesting that a bishop might be sent to him, to instruct and to baptize the nation now entrusted to his charge. His request obtained a speedy response, but it is said that the person first sent to him was a man of austere disposition, and that, having met with no success, he returned home and reported in an assembly of the elders, that he had not been able to benefit the nation to whom he had been sent, by his teaching, because they were stubborn men, hard and barbarous in their minds. Upon this, it is said that there arose a great debate in the council respecting the course to be pursued, when one who was present, addressing the unsuccessful missionary, observed that he seemed to him to have been more severe than he ought towards unlearned hearers, and that he had not, in accordance with the Apostolic rule, first fed them with the milk of smooth doctrine, until, being nourished by degrees in the Word of God, they should be able to understand what was more perfect, and to practise higher things. All eyes were turned upon the speaker, and, after a general discussion upon what he had said, it was determined that he

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 5.

was worthy of the episcopate, and that he ought to be sent to teach the incredulous and the ignorant, since he was gifted with such singular discretion, which is the mother of other virtues.

St. Aidan is sent to King Oswald.

The speaker whose sentiments commanded this universal approbation was none other than St. Aidan, who was accordingly consecrated bishop, and sent forth to preach the Gospel to the Saxon subjects of King Oswald.

Extraordinary jurisdiction exercised by the Abbot of Iona.

It has already been stated that St. Aidan was a monk of Iona, from which monastery he was sent forth on this mission, at the time when Segenius, the fourth from St. Columba, was Abbot. The monastery of Iona possessed extraordinary jurisdiction. St. Bede tells us that it 'was for a long time the head of almost all the monasteries of the northern Scots (Irish), and of those of all the Picts, and had the preeminence in the rule of their people.' In the following chapter St. Bede says that 'it was always the custom for the island of Iona to have for its ruler an abbot who was a priest, to whose jurisdiction both all the province, and even the bishops themselves, by an unusual order, were bound to be subject, after the example of him their first teacher' (St. Columba) 'who was not a bishop, but a priest and a monk.' In order fully to understand this passage, it must be remembered that it was the usual, and perhaps almost the universal practice amongst the Irish in those days, for the abbot of a large monastery to be consecrated bishop, which was not the case with St. Columba,

Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

Ibid. iii. 4.

as is particularly stated by St. Bede. But the jurisdiction attributed to the Abbot of Iona in the above passage, as well as that exercised by him in the sending out St. Aidan and others to preach to the English, would be totally independent of rank in orders, and the instance might perhaps aptly be applied to illustrate the distinction between the two, which is often so imperfectly understood. In the same way it may happen, in a vacancy of the Roman See, that priests acting during the interim of the election of a new pope, may exercise universal jurisdiction over bishops.

It must be presumed that the large powers exercised by the Abbots of Iona, were originally in some way derived from the Roman See. Since this is not expressly stated in history, no argument could be grounded upon the circumstance. At the same time, it is by no means a gratuitous assumption ; for, where history is silent, especially when so imperfect as it is found to be at the best, in reference to those early ages, it is reasonable to supply the deficiency in the manner which seems most in accordance with the universal laws of the church.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

The year 635 is assigned as the date of the Scottish mission to Northumbria.

Reasons for St. Aidan's See not having been fixed at York.

The seat of St. Aidan's episcopate was fixed, at his own request, in the island of Lindisfarne, which was situated in the province of Bernicia. There are writers who interpret this circumstance as a mark of antagonism to the Roman mission, which

had already established York as the episcopal see of Northumbria. But it does not appear certain that King Oswald's dominion, at the period of St. Aidan's arrival, extended beyond the province of Bernicia, and York was situated in Deira. So far from St. Oswald showing hostility to the see of York, he subsequently, when Deira was also united under his sway, generously and piously completed the church of St. Peter the Apostle,[1] in that city, which had been previously commenced, as before stated, by King Edwin. Besides the above-mentioned circumstance, viz. that York may at that time have been external to King Oswald's dominions, it should also be borne in mind that St. Paulinus was still alive, and though it might be considered that he had virtually relinquished the government of the Northumbrian diocese, yet it does not seem certain that he had formally resigned the see; and to have appointed another bishop to it under such circumstances, would have probably been an uncanonical proceeding, and certainly one which would have worn a hostile aspect. For these reasons it appears most natural and becoming that another place should have been fixed upon for the see of the new bishop, and that it should have been situated in the province of Bernicia.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. ii. 14, 20.

[1] In a foot-note at page 97 of Bohn's translated edition of St. Bede's Ecclesiastical History, it is stated, that 'parts of this fabric were discovered beneath the choir of the present cathedral during the repairs rendered necessary by the mad act of the incendiary Jonathan Martin.'

Lindisfarne. Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

The island of Lindisfarne, as St. Bede observes, is twice in the day enclosed by the waves, and twice left contiguous to the land, owing to the flow and ebb of the tide. It was probably from its resemblance, at high water, to his former island monastery of Iona, that this spot was selected by St. Aidan. He brought monks to it and established a monastery, 'in like manner,' says St. Bede, 'as the blessed father Augustine is known to have before done in Kent, the most reverend Pope Gregory writing to him' to advise it.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 27.

The virtues of St. Aidan. Hist. Eccl. iii. 5.

St. Bede loves to dwell on the apostolic virtues of St. Aidan. He tells us that, among other rules of life, he left to the clergy a most salutary example of abstinence or continence; and the fact that he lived with his followers no otherwise than he taught, was to all a very great recommendation of his doctrine, for he cared not to seek or to love anything of this world. It was his delight at once to expend upon the poor whom he met, all that was given him by kings or rich men of the world; and it was his habit to visit all places, whether in town or country, not on horseback, but on foot, unless compelled by urgent necessity. Wherever, as he went along, he saw any persons, whether rich or poor; immediately turning aside to them, he would invite them, if infidels, to accept the faith; or, if believers, he would strengthen them in the same faith, and stimulate them to alms and to the practice of good works, both in words and in deeds.

'His life,' proceeds St. Bede, 'was so different from

the slothfulness of our time, that all who accompanied him, whether tonsured or laymen, were obliged to meditate; that is, to apply themselves to reading the Scriptures or learning psalms. This was the daily work of himself and of all the brethren who were with him, wherever they might go; and if it happened (which, however, seldom came to pass) that he was invited to the King's table, he went in with one or two clergy, and when he had taken a little refreshment, he hastened quickly to be gone, either to read with his monks or to pray. By whose example, at that time, certain religious men and women made it their practice throughout the whole year, excepting during the relaxation of the fifty days of Easter, to protract their fast even to the ninth hour, on the fourth and sixth days of the week. If rich men in anything offended, he never kept silence from motives of respect or of fear; but he corrected them with severe reproof. He never was accustomed to give money to the powerful of this world, but only food, if he received any of them in hospitality; but rather, those gifts of money which were bestowed upon him by the rich, he either dispersed, as has been said, amongst the poor, or spent in the redemption of such as had unjustly been sold. In short, many of those whom he had redeemed at a given price, he afterwards made his disciples, and through teaching and instruction, brought even to the order of the priesthood.'

The pious zeal of St. Oswald. Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

King Oswald failed not by every means in his

power, to second and assist the holy Bishop Aidan in his evangelic labours. In all things, as we are told by St. Bede, the monarch listened humbly and willingly to the admonitions of the prelate, and he very diligently applied himself to do what in him lay, to build up and to extend the church of Christ in his dominions. St. Aidan at the first was only imperfectly acquainted with the English language, but King Oswald, from his long residence amongst the Scots, was well versed in the exercise of their tongue. Hence there was often beheld the edifying spectacle of the Irish bishop preaching to the King's generals and ministers, whilst the earnest-hearted Saxon monarch himself, acted as interpreter of the heavenly message, and explained St. Aidan's meaning to the surrounding audience.

The zeal and success of the Scottish missionaries. Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

'From that time forth,' says St. Bede, 'many began to come daily into Britain from the country of the Scots, and with great devotion to preach the word of faith, in those provinces of the English over which King Oswald reigned, and, as many of them as were priests, to minister the grace of baptism to the believers. Thus churches were built in diverse places; the people flocked together with joy to hear the word; possessions were given by the royal bounty, and territories, for the foundation of monasteries; the young together with the old amongst the English, were instructed by their Scottish teachers in the pursuit and the observance of monastic (*regularis*) discipline. For they were mostly monks who came to preach.'

Is it credible that St. Bede would have left us these glowing eulogies, and warm-hearted, affectionate descriptions of St. Aidan and his fellow-missionaries, together with their noble-minded friend and patron Oswald who was wholly one with them in religious communion, if he had believed that they were all the time in a position of outward ecclesiastical separation from Rome and the universal church?

Instance of direct Roman Catholic communion.

But we are in possession even of more positive and direct evidence than this, that St. Oswald was visibly recognised as Roman Catholic by authority which undeniably was Roman, and consequently that the Scottish communion with which he was identified, was likewise visibly united to Rome and the universal church.

I allude to the fact that the Roman missionary bishop, St. Birinus, as a matter of course admitted King Oswald as a fitting sponsor for King Cynegils of the West Saxons, when he himself baptized him.

The mission of St. Birinus. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 7.

St. Birinus came into Britain in accordance with the counsel of Pope Honorius (*cum consilio Papæ Honorii*), but that pontiff appears to have been careful not to interfere with any mission already established; for St. Bede adds that St. Birinus promised in the Pope's presence, 'that he would sow the seeds of the holy faith in the inner parts of the more remote English (*in intimis ultra Anglorum partibus*), where no teacher had ever been before.' At the command of the Roman pontiff, Birinus received episcopal consecration from Asterius, the bishop of Genoa. The

first region which he entered on reaching Britain, was the country of the Gewissæ, or West Saxons. He found them all to be extreme Pagans (*paganissimos*), and he considered it more useful to remain there, and to proclaim to them the word of God, rather than to advance further in search of others to whom to preach.

St. Birinus baptizes King Cynegils, [and St. Oswald stands as godfather.

His apostolic labours were crowned with success. The King, whose name was Cynegils, was baptized, together with his people; and St. Oswald, before receiving the daughter of Cynegils in marriage, acted as godfather to him who was about to become his father-in-law.

In loc. citat.

Whilst Birinus 'was preaching in the aforesaid province'—thus St. Bede relates the occurrence—'when the King himself, having been instructed, was washed in the font of baptism, together with his people, it happened that Oswald, the most holy and most victorious King of the Northumbrians, was there present at the time, and that he took the charge of him when he came out of the font; and that, by a fellowship truly most beautiful and worthy before God, he first accepted, as his own son dedicated by second birth to God, him whose daughter he was about to receive as his wife (*eumque de lavacro exeuntem suscepisse, ac pulcherrimo prorsus et Deo digno consortio, cujus erat filiam accepturus in conjugem, ipsum prius secunda generatione Deo dedicatum sibi accepit in filium*). But both the kings gave to the same bishop the city called Dorcic, to make

therein his episcopal see; where churches having been built and consecrated, and many people called to the Lord by his pious labour, he passed to the Lord, and was buried in the same city; and after many years, when Hedda was bishop, he was thence translated to the city of Winchester, and laid in the church of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.'

The Anglo-Saxon chronicle briefly records the same event:—

'A. 635. This year King Cynegils was baptized by Birinus the bishop, at Dorchester, and Oswald, King of the North-humbrians, was his god-father.' Monum. Hist. Britan. p. 310.

It is said that the baptism of King Cynegils by Birinus, is still represented on an old font in Winchester cathedral. Bohn's Eccl. Hist. of St. Bede, p. 119 note *

Act of ecclesiastical intercommunion.

Thus did St. Birinus—a bishop consecrated by the Pope's command, and who came directly by the Pope's advice as a new missionary to England—admit, without hesitation, one who was the friend and disciple and favourer of the Scottish Christians, and the spiritual subject of St. Aidan, into the closest spiritual affinity, as sponsor, with his own neophyte, the King of the West Saxons, converted from paganism by his preaching.

It is stated by St. Bede in the passage above quoted, that St. Oswald took part with King Cynegils in bestowing the city of Dorcic (now Dorchester, near Oxford) on St. Birinus, for his episcopal see. He says,—*Donaverunt autem ambo reges eidem episcopo*

civitatem, quæ vocatur Dorcic, ad faciendam inibi sedem episcopalem.

This joint exercise of territorial dominion by King Oswald, in a country so distant from his own, cannot easily be explained excepting under the supposition that, even at that early period of his reign, he had attained the high dignity of Bretwalda. Such is the view taken by Dr. Lingard, who says:—'Oswald, in quality of Bretwalda, confirmed the donation.'

Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 108.

King Oswald's greatness and goodness.

However this may have been, St. Oswald, soon after his accession to the throne, appears to have reached a remarkable height of temporal prosperity and greatness, as well as of heavenly virtue. St. Bede says, that 'King Oswald having been instructed together with that nation of the English over whom he ruled, by the teaching of the most reverend Bishop' (Aidan) 'not only learnt to hope for heavenly kingdoms unknown to his progenitors, but he also obtained more earthly kingdoms than any of his ancestors, from the same One Almighty God, who made heaven and earth. In short, he received the rule of all the nations and provinces of Britain, which are divided into four languages, that is of the Britons, Picts, Scots, and Angles. Nevertheless, when raised to that height of dominion, wonderful to relate, he was always humble, kind, and generous to the poor and to strangers.' Oswald succeeded in uniting the two provinces of Deira and Bernicia under his sceptre, and in healing the variance which had before existed between them. St. Bede says, that he was the

Hist. Eccl. iii. 6.

Ibid.

nephew of 'King Edwin by his sister Acha,' and he remarks that 'it was fitting that so great a predecessor' (as Edwin) 'should have from amongst his own kindred, such an heir both of his religion and his kingdom (*dignumque fuit, ut tantus prædecessor talem haberet de sua consanguinitate et religionis heredem et regni*).'

It will be remembered that St. Bede, in a previous chapter, speaks of St. Oswald and his companions in exile, as having been 'there instructed' (in Christianity) 'according to the doctrine of the Scots, and baptized (*ibique ad doctrinam Scotorum catechizati et baptismatis sunt gratia recreati*).' It is worthy of remark that this circumstance by no means prevented the same venerable Roman Catholic historian from rejoicing, that the Romanly instructed Edwin should have, out of his own kindred, so worthy a successor of his *religion*, as well as of his kingdom, as he found in St. Oswald, whose *religion* was 'according to the doctrine of the Scots.'

See above, p. 242.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 1.

St. Oswald's generous heart.

As an instance of St. Oswald's large-hearted charity, St. Bede relates a story which, however well it may be known, is too beautiful to be passed over in silence. He tells us how 'it was reported' (a not unfrequent expression with this careful writer) that, on one occasion, St. Oswald sitting down to dinner on the holy day of Easter, together with St. Aidan, his bishop, there was brought in and placed before him on the table a silver dish, full of rich and royal meats, and the hands were just stretched out to bless

Hist. Eccl. iii. 6.

the bread, when suddenly the king's servant whose office it was to relieve the needy, came in and told King Oswald that a very great multitude of poor, who had been arriving from all parts, were seated in the streets and asking something from the king in alms. The Christian-hearted monarch instantly gave command that the rich banquet which had just been placed before him, should be carried out and distributed amongst the poor; and he ordered that the silver dish on which it was laid should be broken up into small pieces, and divided amongst the whole number.

The holy Bishop Aidan who sat by, moved with delight at this merciful and noble act, seizing the King's right hand, exclaimed:—'Never may this right hand decay!' *Nunquam inveterascat hæc manus!*

'According to his prayer of benediction,' adds St. Bede, 'it came to pass.' *Quod et ita juxta votum benedictionis ejus provenit.* For when Oswald subsequently fell in battle against the Pagan Mercians, his hands were severed from his body, but they did not perish, nor were they lost, nor are they known to have ever become corrupt.

St. Oswald's hand.
Hist. Eccl. iii. 6.

Ninety years save one had elapsed since the event above recorded, when St. Bede concluded his 'Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation;' yet that truthful and venerable writer assures us, that the holy hands of Oswald remained in his day still incorrupt—preserved, as venerated relics, in a silver chest in the church of St. Peter, in the royal city of

Bamborough. The following are his simple words: *Nam cum, interfecto illo in pugna, manus cum brachio a cetero essent corpore resectæ, contigit ut hactenus incorruptæ perdurent. Denique in urbe regia, quæ a regina quondam vocabulo Bebba cognominatur, loculo inclusæ argenteo in ecclesia Sancti Petri servantur, ac digno a cunctis honore venerantur.*

A series of subsequent witnesses to the continued incorruption of the same right hand, is produced by the Bollandist Father Pinius, commencing with the celebrated Alcuin, who wrote later than St. Bede, though in the same eighth century. He wrote respecting the holy hand of St. Oswald, in his day, as follows:— Acta SS. 5 Aug. In vit. S. Oswaldi Comment. Præv. § ii. nn. 19–21.

> 'Hactenus integram fore signo est ungula crescens,
> Flexilis et nervus, viridis caro, forma venusta.'

In the twelfth century, William of Malmesbury thus testified concerning it: 'That royal right hand, the giver of so great alms, even to this day remains incorrupt, with the arm, skin, and sinews; but all the rest of the body, with the exception of the bones, being dissolved into ashes, has not escaped the common lot of mortality.' Ibid.

Roger of Hoveden, in the same and the following century; Matthew of Westminster, in the fourteenth; John Capgrave in the fifteenth; all and each of them bear witness that, in their own days respectively, St. Oswald's hand was still preserved from incorruption. Ibid.

In the sixteenth century Nicolas Harpsfeld most

In loc. citat. et Alford. Ann. Eccl. t. ii. p. 263.

explicitly testified to the same fact in his time. Referring to the occurrence which has been related, he says:—'Aidan, who was seated at the table, struck with admiration at this munificence of the King, prayed that so liberal a hand might never wither, whose prayer, up to these our own times, has never been frustrated.' Again he says: 'That munificent hand has never decayed; and what Bede in his time, and others subsequently in theirs, have handed down as being true, our own age also has confirmed. There are alive at the present day most worthy and unexceptionable witnesses, who have related to me that it has been seen by them.'

Thus firmly through all those ages was it believed, (and who will dare to doubt it now?), that God miraculously preserved St. Oswald's hand from all corruption; an attestation alike of the Saxon monarch's sanctity, and of the power of his holy Scottish bishop's blessing.

Now the veneration thus manifested to this special relic of St. Oswald, belonged to the whole of that period of English history, in which no one would be esteemed a saint who was not visibly a Catholic, and no one would be esteemed a Catholic who was not visibly in communion with Rome. Therefore it is evident that from the earliest times, St. Oswald and St. Aidan (for they are inseparable in this respect) were regarded as Roman Catholics.

Where is now that holy hand?

The so-called Reformation consigned holy relics to the flames, and scattered the ashes of the saints to

the winds and to the waves, impiously pretending to honour God by insulting the bodies and the memorials of His dearest friends. None perhaps but God, and His holy angels and His saints, now know, where the sacred right hand of Oswald at the present day reposes; yet Christian piety can scarcely doubt, that those verses of an ancient poet must be applicable to it still, which are quoted by Father Pinius from Camden's 'Britannia,' and which describe this holy hand as unconsumed by worm or by decay; unharmed by cold or heat; ever remaining unchanged; alive whilst dead:—

In loco citato.

> 'Nullo verme perit, nulla putredine tabet
> Dextra viri, nullo constringi frigore, nullo
> Dissolvi fervore potest: sed semper eodem
> Immutata statu persistit, mortua vivit.'

St. Oswald's death. Hist. Eccl. iii. 9.

'Oswald the most Christian king of the Northumbrians,' says St. Bede, 'reigned for nine years, that year also being numbered with them which both the savage unmercifulness of the King of the Britons, and the mad apostasy of the English Kings, has made detestable.' The great and holy monarch was killed in battle against the same pagan nation and pagan King, Penda of the Mercians, who had before been leagued with the cruel British Cadwalla, against his predecessor, Edwin; and it was in battle against these chieftains that Edwin himself had been slain, as previously related.

The high-souled and devout King Oswald was in

the thirty-eighth year of his age, when his glorious earthly career was to human sight so unhappily cut short, on the 5th of August, A.D. 642. He fell with words of prayer for others on his lips. St. Bede says that when, 'beset with weapons and with enemies, he saw that he was now on the very point of being killed, he prayed to the Lord for the souls of his army. Hence,' proceeds the historian, 'men say in the proverb, "Lord, have mercy upon souls, said Oswald, falling to the ground."' *Unde dicunt in proverbio, 'Deus miserere animabus, dixit Oswaldus, cadens in terram.'*

Hist. Eccl. iii. 12.

In the Anglo-Saxon chronicle his death is thus recorded:—

Monum. Hist. Britan. p. 311.

'A. 642. This year Oswald, king of the North-umbrians, was slain by Penda and the South-umbrians, at Maser-field, on the Nones of August, and his body was buried at Bardney. His sanctity and his miracles were afterwards manifested in various parts beyond his island, and his hands are at Bamborough, uncorrupted.'

St. Oswald's relics. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 12.

After his victory, the heathen Penda commanded the head, and hands with the arms, of the holy Oswald, to be cut off from his body, and set up on stakes. But after a year, Oswy, his brother and successor in the province of Bernicia, came with an army and took them away. He placed the head in the cemetery of the church of Lindisfarne, but the hands and the arms, as above said, in St. Peter's Church at Bamborough.

Heavenly attestation of St. Oswald's sanctity. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 11.

By the pious care of Oswy's daughter, Ofthrida, who was married to the king of the Mercians, the remaining venerable relics of her uncle, King Oswald, were conveyed to the monastery of Bardney, in Lincolnshire, which the aforesaid queen and her husband are said to have especially loved and honoured. The monks, says St. Bede, knew that Oswald was a holy man, but 'because he had been born in another province, and had received dominion over them, they retained their ancient hatred towards him, even still when he was dead (*etsi sanctum eum noverant, tamen quia de alia provincia ortus fuerat et super eos regnum acceperat, veteranis eum odiis etiam mortuum insequebantur*).' Hence, when the carriage in which St. Oswald's remains were conveyed reached the monastery as evening was drawing on, its inmates were unwilling to receive them; and the holy relics were left outside for the night, with only a tent cloth extended over them. 'But,' says St. Bede, 'the manifestation of a heavenly miracle made it plain how reverently they ought to be received by all the faithful; for all through the night there was visible, in almost all places of the same province of Lindsey, a column of light, which reached from that carriage up to heaven.' When morning came, the monks, admonished by this celestial sign, were as anxious to be enriched with King Oswald's precious relics as before they had been forward in their refusal to admit them. Having reverently washed the sacred bones,

they laid them in a chest which they had prepared, and placed them with due honour in the church. They hung up over the tomb St. Oswald's banner of purple and gold, in order that the royal person of so holy a man might never be forgotten; and they poured out the water in which they had washed his relics, in a corner of the *sacrarium.* Devils were cast out, and sick were healed, by the dust of the ground which was thus imbued with this holy water of ablution.

Miracles wrought through St. Oswald's relics. Hist. Eccl. iii. 9.

St. Bede also says that down to his time, both sick persons and cattle were healed on the spot where St. Oswald was killed, so that many used to carry away the earth for the benefit of the sick, till there came to be a hole in the place as deep as a man's height. 'It is no wonder,' adds St. Bede, 'that the sick should be healed at the death-place of him, who never ceased whilst he lived, to provide always for the sick and the poor, to give them alms, and to assist them.' St. Bede fills pages with his account of the miracles wrought through the relics of St. Oswald. Amongst others he mentions the case of a young student in Ireland, who was healed from a deadly plague when at the point of death, by water containing a chip of the stake on which St. Oswald's head had been exposed by the pagans.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 13.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 12.

In another chapter, he tells of a little boy who was completely cured of ague by remaining close to St. Oswald's tomb, by the advice of one of the monks of Bardney, till the hour of his fit had passed away.

St. Bede adds that it was not surprising that 'the prayers of that king, now reigning with our Lord, should be of great avail in His sight, since, whilst he formerly held the government of a temporal kingdom, he was wont always to labour and to pray more for the kingdom which is eternal.

'In short,' he proceeds, 'they say that from the time of the morning lauds he would very often persevere in his prayers till day, and on account of his frequent practice of prayer or of giving thanks to the Lord, he was always in the habit, wheresoever he was sitting, of holding his hands flat upon his knees.' After this follows the account how St. Oswald ended his life in prayer. Ibid.

Thus, though Oswald was in closest ecclesiastical communion with the Scots, the Roman Catholic St. Bede does not hesitate to speak of him as now reigning with our Lord in glory, which is a manifest sign that he did not consider the Scottish Christians to be separated from the visible communion of Rome and the universal Church.

St. Oswald's general fame for sanctity. Hist. Eccl. iii. 13.

St. Bede says moreover, that 'the fame of this illustrious man not only enlightened all the territory of Britain, but that, spreading far the rays of its healing light, even beyond the ocean, it reached at the same time parts of Germany and Ireland. In short,' he adds, 'the most reverend bishop Acca is wont to relate, that when, being on his way to Rome, he stayed, together with his bishop, Wilfrid, with the most holy Wilbrord, Archbishop of the nation of the

Frisons, he often heard him give an account of the wonders which had been wrought in that province, through the relics of the same most reverend King' Oswald.

The weight of St. Bede's authority.

On all questions of English ecclesiastical history connected with this period, St. Bede is our most sure and reliable authority, and I have therefore not hesitated largely to paraphrase his words, or to quote them freely from his pages. But he is far from being the only Roman Catholic writer who testifies to the holiness of St. Oswald, a quality which no such writer would attribute to anyone who held habitual ecclesiastical communion with men who were separated from the Roman See. Amongst other authors of eminence, the famous Alcuin, the pupil of St. Bede, and tutor of the Emperor Charlemagne, bears witness to St. Oswald's sanctity, and to the wide-spread fame of his miracles. Alcuin is the author of the following verses of unequivocal and unexceptional admiration. They are quoted by the before-mentioned Bollandist, Father Pinius, as having been written by Alcuin on St. Oswald, and it is from the pages of Father Pinius that I extract them:—

Alcuin's praise of St. Oswald.

In loco citato, n. 16.

'Vir virtute potens, patriæ tutator, amator,
Moribus egregius, Christi mandata secutus,
Pauperibus largus, parcus sibi, dives in omnes,
Judiciis verax, animi pietate benignus,
Excelsus meritis, summissus mente sed ipsa,
Hostibus horribilis, cunctis jocundus amicis,
Ut bello indomitus, sic pacta in pace fidelis.
Invaluit postquam sceptris et culmine regni,

Extruit ecclesias, donisque exornat opimis,
Vasa ministeriis præstans pretiosa sacratis,
Argento, gemmis aras vestivit et auro,
Serica parietibus tendens velamina sacris,
Auri blateolis[1] pulcrè distincta coronis,
Sanctaque suspendit varias per tecta lucernas,
Esset ut in templis cæli stellantis imago,
Christicolasque greges duxit devotus in illa,
Ut fierent Domino laudes sine fine canentûm.
O pietas, ô celsa fides! nam quidquid habebat,
Prodigus in Domini gazarum sparsit honorem:
Quapropter titulis virtutum claruit, atque
Signorum celebri fama est vulgatus ubique,
Quæ modò per mundum chartis inscripta leguntur.'

Commemoration of St. Oswald in the Roman Martyrology.

If it be thought that anything more is required, in order to prove that St. Oswald was a Roman Catholic, we have but to turn to the Roman martyrology itself, where we find a complete confirmation of the above testimony. St. Oswald is therein commemorated, on the 5th of August, as follows: 'In England' (the feast) 'of St. Oswald, king, whose acts the venerable presbyter, Bede, commemorates.'

In Anglia Sancti Oswaldi regis, cujus actus venerabilis Beda presbyter commemorat.

It has been seen that amongst the foremost of the said acts of St. Oswald, St. Bede gives a full account of that king's introduction of the Scottish missionaries into his own kingdom of Northumbria. Now these are the very missionaries who, according to Dr. Pusey, were 'out of communion with Rome.'

[1] Intellige *purpureis*. Vide Du Cange, Gloss. in voce *Blatta*. —Nota Ed. Bolland.

Yet it is evident that, if such had been the case, the compilers of the Roman martyrology would not have referred the faithful to a history, which prominently records the circumstances respecting St. Oswald's introduction of the same missionaries into his country, as well as his close and constant ecclesiastical communion with their persons and their church, from his baptism to his death.

Such argument, however, is rendered superfluous by the fact that St. Aidan himself, as will be seen, is also commemorated with distinction in the same Roman martyrology.

St. Oswald was popularly styled Martyr.

The aforesaid Roman martyrology does not, however, assign to St. Oswald the title of Martyr, though it was very commonly conferred upon him. Strictly speaking, there does not appear to have been sufficient ground for it; but it was bestowed on him by the affection of his people, in whose behalf he died in battle against the heathen, with a prayer for human souls upon his lips.

St. Aidan of Lindisfarne.

The history of St. Aidan is inseparably blended with that of St. Oswald. In recounting the good deeds of the latter, I have unavoidably been led to speak of the former so fully, that little more remains to be said. St. Bede seems to dwell with peculiar affection and delight, on the virtues and missionary zeal of the Scottish apostle of Northumbria, a kingdom to which he himself belonged, and the incipient conversion of which by the Roman St. Paulinus, had before been so rudely disturbed and cut short.

St. Aidan's death. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 17.

St. Aidan had completed the sixteenth year of his episcopate when called to his heavenly reward. He was engaged in his usual missionary labours in a district whose centre was a country village of the King's, not far from the city of Bamborough, when he was seized with his mortal sickness. There was a church in the same village, and when St. Aidan was taken ill, they put up for him a tent against the western wall of the building. This tent enclosed a wooden prop or buttress to the wall, and leaning against this wooden prop St. Aidan breathed his last. 'His body,' St. Bede says, 'was at once translated from thence to the island of Lindisfarne, and buried in the cemetery of the brethren. But after some time, when a larger cathedral (*basilica*) was built there,[1] and dedicated in honour of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, his bones were removed to it, and deposited at the right of the altar, according to the veneration due to so great a pontiff.'

His relics.

Ensuing miracles.

Some years after the death of St. Aidan, Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, again attacked Northumbria with a hostile army, and laid it waste with fire and sword. The village in which St. Aidan died was on that occasion set on fire and consumed in the flames, together with its church. But the wooden prop which had supported the expiring Saint

[1] This new church at Lindisfarne, as St. Bede states elsewhere (B. iii. c. 25), was built by St. Finan, who succeeded St. Aidan in the episcopate, and was dedicated to St. Peter the Apostle, by Archbishop Theodore some time afterwards.

was miraculously preserved uninjured. The flames had no power to consume that post, though they destroyed everything else that was round about. The miracle becoming known, and the church being again rebuilt, the same wooden prop was used as before for an outside support to the wall. Some time afterwards another conflagration, which was the result of carelessness, again destroyed the said village with its church. But on this occasion also, the post against which St. Aidan had leaned as he expired, escaped uninjured. The flames of fire curled through the very holes through which it was fastened to the wall, but they were miraculously prevented from having any power over the wooden prop itself. 'Wherefore,' proceeds St. Bede, 'the church having been built there a third time, they did not affix that prop, as before, outside, by way of support, but they placed it inside the church itself, in memory of the miracle, where those who entered should bend the knee and implore the mercy of heaven. And it is well known that since that time, many have obtained the grace of being healed in the same place; nay, many have sought remedies for the sickness of themselves and those belonging to them, by chips cut off from the said post, and put into water.'

St. Aidan's ejaculation averts the burning of Bamborough. Hist. Eccl. iii. 16.

In his lifetime, as St. Bede relates, St. Aidan's appeal to God had preserved the city of Bamborough from the flames. The same redoubtable Penda of the Mercians, not having succeeded in taking the city by storm, had on that occasion heaped up an immense pile

of combustibles against it, on the land side; and when the wind was favourable, he set them on fire, in order to burn the city. St. Aidan, from the neighbouring Isle of Farne, where he was wont at times to retire for privacy and prayer, beheld the mounting flames and smoke, and it was said that, raising his hands and eyes to heaven, he exclaimed with tears: 'Behold, Lord, what great evils Penda does!'—*Vide, Domine, quanta mala facit Penda!* At the word the wind's direction was reversed, and the flames, being borne away by it from the city, were blown in the face of the hostile army. Some were injured, all were terrified; and acknowledging the hand of God, they raised the siege.

St. Aidan's great reward. Hist. Eccl. iii. 14, 15.

In reference to St. Aidan's death, St. Bede unhesitatingly affirms that, 'having been removed from this world, he received from the Lord the endless reward of his labours.' *De sæculo ablatus, perpetua laborum suorum a Domino præmia recepit.* And immediately afterwards he adds, that 'the beholder of the inward heart made outwardly manifest, even by the sign of miracles, how great his merit was.' *Qui cujus meriti fuerit, etiam miraculorum signis internus arbiter edocuit.*

St. Bede's remarks upon St. Aidan.

I will not pause to repeat other anecdotes related of St. Aidan by St. Bede. But I must not pass over unnoticed three particular passages, wherein the Saxon saint and historian speaks expressly of St. Aidan's Celtic observance of Easter, and comments upon it with freedom. The first of these passages

occurs immediately after the mention of St. Oswald's request to the Scots, that they would send him a bishop to instruct his people. St. Bede having related this, continues:—

The first passage. Hist. Eccl. iii. 3.

'He obtained what he sought without delay. For he received the Pontiff Aidan, a man of the greatest meekness, piety, and moderation, and one who had the zeal of God, but not wholly according to knowledge. For he was wont to observe the Lord's Paschal Day, after the custom of his nation which we have very often mentioned, from the fourteenth moon to the twentieth. For indeed, the northern province of the Scots and the whole nation of the Picts at that time still celebrated the Lord's Pasch according to this rule, supposing that they therein followed the writings of the holy and praiseworthy Father Anatolius. Every person of learning very easily perceives whether this is true. But the Scottish nations which dwelt in the southern parts of the island of Ireland, had recently learned, through the admonition of the bishop of the Apostolic See, to observe the Pasch in the canonical manner.'

In the second of the passages referred to, St. Bede speaks still more strongly in condemnation of St. Aidan's practice as regards the time for the observance of Easter, but none the less warmly of his virtues. The said passage forms the conclusion of the chapter telling of St. Aidan's death and of the circumstances which ensued, as above stated; after which St. Bede proceeds as follows:—

The second passage. Hist. Eccl. iii. 17.

'But I have written these things respecting the person and the works of the aforesaid man; by no means praising or commending in him what he less perfectly understood

concerning the observance of Easter; nay, very much detesting the same, as I have most plainly proved in the book which I have composed "De temporibus;" but, as a true historian, simply describing those things which were done by him or through him, and praising such things as are deserving of praise in his acts, and recording them for the use of the readers: namely, his earnest pursuit of peace and charity, of continence and humility; his mind victorious over anger and avarice, and holding pride and vainglory alike in contempt; his industry, both in performing and in teaching the heavenly commandments; his diligence in reading and watching; his authority, worthy of a priest, in repressing the haughty and powerful, and likewise his tenderness in consoling the infirm, and relieving or defending the poor. To comprise many things in a brief sentence, so far as we have learned from those who knew him, he took pains not to neglect any of all the things which through the evangelical, or apostolical, or prophetical writings, he knew were to be done, but with all his might to fulfil all of them in his works. These things in the aforesaid bishop I much esteem and love, because certainly I have no doubt that these things were pleasing to God. But I neither approve nor praise his not observing Easter at its proper season, either through ignorance of its canonical time, or, if he knew it, being prevailed upon by the authority of his nation not to follow it. Yet this I do approve in him, that in the celebration of his Easter, he had nothing else at heart, he venerated and preached nothing else than that which we do, that is, the redemption of the human race, through the passion, resurrection, ascension into heaven of the Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ. So that he did not, as some falsely suppose,[1] keep this feast on the fourteenth moon

[1] Here again there is apparently an allusion to Eddius. See above, pp. 159, 231.

on whatever day of the week it might fall, with the Jews, but always on the Lord's day, from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon; on account of his faith in the Lord's resurrection, which took place on the first day of the week, and on account of his hope in our own resurrection, which, together with holy church, he believed will verily come to pass on the same first day of the week, which is now called the Lord's Day. *Unde et hanc non, ut quidam falso opinantur, quarta decima luna in qualibet feria cum Judæis, sed die Dominica semper agebat, a luna quarta decima usque ad vicesimam; propter fidem videlicet Dominicæ resurrectionis quam una sabbati factam, propterque spem nostræ resurrectionis quam eadem una sabbati, quæ nunc Dominica dies dicitur, veraciter futuram cum sancta ecclesia credebat.*'

The third passage which now remains to be quoted, is still more explicit than any yet mentioned, in its testimony to the fact that Bishop Aidan, and consequently his clergy and disciples, were not looked upon as severed from the Roman Catholic communion, although they kept their Easter after their own Celtic fashion. In his chapter on the Synod of Whitby, which will shortly be more fully noticed, St. Bede gives an account of the state of things at that time, in reference to the Paschal controversy, and in the course of his remarks he says:—

The third passage. Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

'But this difference of Paschal observance during the lifetime of Aidan was patiently tolerated by all men, who clearly understood that, although he could not keep Easter contrary to the custom of those who had sent him, yet he diligently strove to fulfil the works of faith, of piety, and of love, according to the custom habitual to all saints; so that he was deservedly loved by all, even by those who

differed respecting Easter; and was held in veneration not only by ordinary persons, but also by the bishops themselves, Honorius of Canterbury and Felix of the East Angles.'

Archbishop Honorius. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. ii. 18.

Archbishop Honorius had received the pall direct from the Pope, with an affectionate letter, after his consecration by St. Paulinus.

Bishop Felix. Ibid. ii. 15.

Bishop Felix was a native of Burgundy, in which country also he was ordained. He had been sent, at his own request, by Archbishop Honorius, to preach the gospel to the East Angles. Whatever might have been the apparent virtues of St. Aidan, if he or his followers had been 'out of communion with Rome,' it is impossible that such men as Archbishop Honorius and Bishop Felix should have held him 'in veneration.'

Testimony of the Roman Church.

Nay, the Roman Church herself publicly claims St. Aidan as her own, and tells of the vision of his soul borne by angels into heaven, through which the great St. Cuthbert was induced to embrace the monastic life. The Roman Martyrology thus commemorates St. Aidan, on the 5th of August:—

'In England' (the feast) 'of St. Aidan, bishop of Lindisfarne, whose soul having been seen carried up to heaven, by St. Cuthbert the shepherd, having left his sheep he became a monk.'

In Anglia sancti Aidani Episcopi Lindisfarnensis, cujus animam cum sanctus Cuthbertus ovium pastor in cœlum ferri vidisset, relictis ovibus factus est monachus.

After this amount of counter-testimony it cannot be believed that St. Aidan and his fellow-missionaries, whose different Paschal observance, St. Bede says, 'was patiently tolerated by all men,' were outwardly separated from Roman Catholic communion.

St. Finan, second bishop of Lindisfarne.

The death of St. Aidan occurred in the year 651. He was succeeded in the episcopate by St. Finan, who was also a monk of Iona, and a strenuous maintainer of the Celtic practices. According to St. Bede, the efforts which were made to induce him to conform to the general practice, only rendered him more obstinate in his adherence to that of his own people. Yet the English Martyrology, as quoted by the Bollandist father, Henschenius, records that, 'in every kind of good conversation, and in holiness of life, he ended his blessed days about the year of Christ 660.'

Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

Vita S. Finani, Acta SS. 17 Feb.

The baptism of King Peada of the Middle Angles, by the Scots.

During St. Finan's episcopate, in the year 653, Peada, King of the Middle Angles, to which throne he had been elevated by his father, the old heathen King Penda of the Mercians, came to Oswy, King of the Northumbrians, to ask for his daughter Elfleda in marriage. When he heard the word of Christian truth, being very much persuaded also by his friend Alfrid, King Oswy's son, who had married Peada's sister Cyneberga, he embraced the Christian religion, and was baptized by St. Finan at a village of King Oswy's, called 'At the Wall,' supposed to

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 21.

be the modern Walton, or, according to Smith, Waubottle, near Newcastle. Together with Peada, all the counts and soldiers who were in his company, as well as their servants, were baptized. Peada then having received four priests to preach the gospel to his people and baptize them, returned joyful to his home. The priests were successful in their mission in his province. They were willingly listened to, and many persons, high and low in rank, daily renounced idolatry and were baptized. Neither did his pagan father, Penda, forbid them to preach in Mercia. He tolerated Christianity, but he hated and despised all such as professed the faith of Christ without corresponding works, saying, that those persons were contemptible and miserable who refused to obey the God in whom they believed.

Bohn, p. 144, note *.

The Scottish mission in Mid-Anglia.

Two years afterwards King Penda was defeated in battle and slain by the Christian King Oswy, of Northumbria, and the government of Mercia having passed into Oswy's hands, one of the aforesaid priests, a Scot of the name of Diuma, was consecrated by St. Finan as Bishop both of the Midland Angles and the Mercians. He died and was buried among the Middle Angles, having converted many people to the faith. He was succeeded in the episcopate by another Scot, named Ceollach, who, not long afterwards having left his bishopric, returned to the parent monastery of Iona. His successor in the same bishopric was Trumhere, who is described by St. Bede as 'a religious man,

The Scottish mission is extended into Mercia. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 21.

and educated in monastic life, by nation indeed English, but ordained bishop by the Scots,' by whom he had been taught.

St. Cedd. Hist. Eccl. iii. 21, 22.

Ibid. c. 23.

St. Bede also mentions St. Cedd as being one of the four priests sent with King Peada to evangelize the Midland Angles. He was brother to St. Chad, and first founder of the monastery of Lastingham, in which house he established the religious customs of Lindisfarne, where he had himself been educated.

The Scottish mission amongst the East Saxons. Ibid. c. 22.

Whilst St. Cedd was engaged in his mission amongst the Middle Angles, King Sigebert of the East Saxons was induced to embrace Christianity through the exhortations of King Oswy of Northumbria, A.D. 653, and he, like Peada, received baptism from the hands of St. Finan, at the village called 'At the Wall.' It was so called because it was close to the old Roman wall, about twelve miles distant from the eastern sea. Sigebert also, in like manner, asked for priests to evangelize his people. St. Cedd was consequently called from the province of the Middle Angles, and sent to the East Saxons, with another priest as his companion. After they had travelled throughout the country and 'gathered,' says St. Bede, 'a numerous church to the Lord,' St. Cedd went to Lindisfarne to consult with St. Finan, who, on learning his success, with the assistance of two other bishops consecrated him Bishop of the East Saxons. The territory of that people extended over Essex, Middlesex, and the south of Hertfordshire. Their metropolis was London, and their last

bishop, before they cast off the faith, had been the Roman St. Mellitus. In this way did the See of St. Mellitus devolve upon a disciple of the Scots, and a follower of their ecclesiastical usages. St. Cedd, however, abandoned those practices for the Roman, after the conference of Whitby.

St. Cedd's places of residence. In loc. citat

When St. Cedd returned to his province as bishop, he built churches in several places, and ordained priests and deacons to assist him in his spiritual labours. He mostly resided in a city called Ithancestir, which was on the river Pante, now the Blackwater River, near Maldon in Essex; and in another named Tilaburg (now Tilbury), near the Thames, opposite to Gravesend. 'In which places,' says St. Bede, 'having collected a flock of the servants of Christ, he taught them to observe the discipline of a regular life, so far as the rude people were yet able to receive it.'

Bohn, p. 147, notes.

Ireland's large share in England' conversion.

Thus the field of missionary labour at that time occupied by the Scots in England, extended from the Tweed to the Thames, comprising all the interior of the country from the borders of Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire, as far west as Wales, and including on the east the aforesaid kingdom of the East Saxons. It was to the missionary efforts of the Scots that the establishment, or revival, of Christianity was due throughout this large portion of our island. Now, as before observed, the term Scot at that time designated the Irish; and the monastery of Iona, which was the mother and the centre of all these missions, was

essentially Irish in its foundation and its history. Owing to the more modern application and restriction of the term Scot to our Caledonian neighbours, we are too apt to forget how largely we are indebted to Ireland for the conversion of our heathen ancestors.

The history of the Whitby Conference.

The Scots no doubt would everywhere carry with them their peculiar Celtic customs, respecting the time of keeping Easter, and the tonsure. It is not therefore surprising that as the church advanced, and as the Roman and Scottish missions came into closer contact with one another, greater confusion should have arisen from those differences of practice, which had been borne with and tolerated, on both sides, for near thirty years after the first arrival of the Scottish missionaries in Northumbria. James, the deacon left by St. Paulinus, adhered constantly to his Roman Easter, together with all those whom he could persuade to adopt it, and yet continued instructing the people and baptizing, apparently together with the Scots, with whom he was evidently on friendly terms; for St. Bede tells us that he taught them the ecclesiastical chant, according to the custom in Rome and at Canterbury.

The differences in discipline were mutually tolerated at the first. See above, p. 276. See above, pp. 240, 241.

St. Colman, third bishop of Lindisfarne. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

About the year 661, St. Finan died. He was succeeded in the Bishopric of Lindisfarne by St. Colman, who was also sent out of Scotland, and who was a strenuous and an obstinate maintainer of the Celtic observance of Easter. In his time the con-

Matters at last come to a crisis. In loc. citat.

troversy respecting Easter and other points of ecclesiastical discipline, says St. Bede, assumed a more serious aspect (*gravior de observatione Paschæ necnon et de aliis ecclesiasticæ vitæ disciplinis controversia nata est*). He adds that 'this question justly disturbed the thoughts and hearts of many, who feared lest perchance, having received the name of Christian, they were running, or had run, in vain.' Those who came from Kent or from France, protested that the Scots observed Easter at variance with the custom of the universal church. Foremost among these was Ronan, himself a Scot, but who had learned the true ecclesiastical rule in the countries of Gaul or Italy. He had been in the habit of arguing the point with St. Finan, by which means many were set right, or brought to enquire more carefully into the subject. But St. Finan himself, so far from being amended, only became more obstinate, and more openly opposed to the truth. James the deacon also, as has been said, observed the true and Catholic Easter, and taught as many as he could to do the same. King Oswy, who had been baptized and instructed by the Scots, thought nothing could be better than what they taught. His son Alfrid, on the other hand, who had been instructed in the Christian religion by St. Wilfrid, after that saint's return from Rome and Gaul, rightly perceived that his teaching ought to be preferred to all the traditions of the Scots. Queen Eanfleda, the wife of Oswy, who was the daughter of King Edwin the dis-

ciple and friend of St. Paulinus, also followed the Roman usages, as she had seen done during her sojourn in Kent; her followers did the same, as well as the priest Romanus, whom she had with her from Kent. Thus it is said sometimes to have happened in those days, that Easter was celebrated twice in the same year, and that whilst 'the king, having ended the fasts, was keeping the Paschal Sunday, the queen and her people, still continuing the fast, were celebrating the Day of Palms.'

Assembling of the conference at Whitby, A.D. 664.

Bishop Agilbert, who has previously been mentioned, was at that time in Northumbria; and, at the request of King Alfrid, he had ordained St. Wilfrid as priest, in St. Wilfrid's own monastery of Ripon. Bishop Agilbert had with him a priest named Agatho. The questions respecting the Pasch and other ecclesiastical matters having been raised, it was determined to assemble a synod in the monastery of St. Hilda, at Whitby, by which an end might be put to the disputes which had now reached so great a height. Here the two parties met, not as men divided by religious communion, but as members of one church, who came together to discuss an important question of internal ecclesiastical discipline. It is to be remarked, that the assembly itself was held in a Celtic monastery, and that the responsible office of interpreter was entrusted to a bishop who belonged to the party of the Celts.

Dignitaries present. Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

'There came there,' says St. Bede, 'both the kings, namely, the father and the son' (Oswy of Nor-

thumbria, and Alfrid who ruled the province of Deira under him); 'Bishops, Colman, with his clergy from Scotia; Agilbert, with Agatho and Wilfrid, priests. James and Romanus were on the side of the latter. The Abbess Hilda and her followers were on the side of the Scots, on which was also the venerable Bishop Cedd, not long before ordained by the Scots, as has been said, and who showed himself in that council a most careful interpreter for both parties.'

Proceedings of the synod.

King Oswy opened the business of the assembly by observing, that 'those who served one God ought to follow one rule of life, and not to differ in the celebration of the heavenly sacraments, when they all of them hoped for one kingdom in heaven; but rather to enquire which was the truer tradition, and that such should be followed by all in common.' He then called upon his own bishop, Colman, to state in the first place his custom and its origin. Colman said that he had received his rule for the observance of Easter from his superiors, who had sent him there as bishop, and that all their fathers, men beloved by God, were known to have kept it in the same way; he further appealed to the authority of St. John the Evangelist, the disciple specially beloved by our Lord, and the churches over which he presided, as having followed the same practice; and he added other similar remarks. When St. Colman had ended, the king called on Agilbert also to set forth his custom with its origin, or the authority on which

St. Colman states his practice and his reasons for it.

St. Wilfrid and St. Colman discuss the question.

it rested. Upon which Bishop Agilbert begged that his disciple, the priest Wilfrid, might speak in his stead, on account of his own imperfect acquaintance with the English language. St. Wilfrid accordingly appealed to what he had found to be the custom of all in 'Rome, where the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul lived, taught, suffered, and were buried;' adding, that the same was practised by all, throughout Italy and Gaul, as well as throughout Africa, Asia, Egypt, Greece, and the whole world, excepting only the Scots, with the Picts and Britons their accomplices, with whom in these two last islands of the ocean (England and Ireland), and not indeed in the whole of them, they foolishly laboured to contend against all the world. St. Colman responded that he wondered he should call their labour foolish, since they therein followed the example of so great an apostle, who was found worthy to repose on the breast of the Lord, and whom all the world knew to have lived most wisely. St. Wilfrid then explained, as has been stated already, that St. John, out of compassion for the weakness of the Jewish converts, kept Easter on the day of their Passover, whether Sunday or otherwise, whilst St. Colman and the Celts never kept it except on a Sunday, though they differed from the Roman tradition in the calculation of that Sunday. He affirmed that St. Peter kept the Pasch from the 15th to the 21st; and consequently he argued that the Celts neither agreed with St. John, nor with St. Peter,

See above, pp. 156, 157.

nor with the Law, nor with the Gospel, 'in the celebration of the greatest festival.'

St. Colman enquired in reply, whether the holy man Anatolius held what was contrary to the law or the gospel, who wrote that the Pasch was to be kept from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon; and whether it was to be believed that their father Columba and his successors, men dear to God, who kept Easter in the same way, had thought or acted contrary to the divine scriptures? He alluded to the miracles, by which the sanctity of many amongst them was attested, and added that, entertaining no doubt these men were saints, he never ceased to imitate their life, manners, and discipline. St. Wilfrid, in reply, acknowledged the holiness and learning of Anatolius, but showed that the Celts did not really follow his rule. He then concluded, as follows:—

'But concerning your father Columba and his followers, whose sanctity you say that you imitate, and whose rule and whose precepts you say that you follow, being confirmed by signs from heaven, I might answer: that to many who at the judgment say to the Lord that they have prophesied in His Name, and cast out devils and done many wonders, the Lord will answer that He never knew them. But far be it from me to say this of your fathers; since it is much more just to believe good rather than evil of those who are unknown to us. Wherefore I do not deny that they are the servants of God, and dear to God, who loved God with artless simplicity, but pious intention. Nor do I think that such an observance of Easter was much hindrance to them, so long as no one came to show

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.

them the decrees of a more perfect rule, which they should follow. I certainly believe that they would have followed the admonitions of a catholic calculator, if such a one had then come to them, in the same way as they are shown to have followed those commandments of God which they knew and had learned.

'But thou, and thy companions, if, having heard the decrees of the apostolic see, yea of the universal church, and these confirmed by holy writ, you scorn to follow them, without any doubt you sin. For although thy fathers were saints, is their small number out of one corner of a most remote island, to be preferred to the universal church of Christ throughout the world? And if this your Columba, yea and ours also, if he was Christ's, were holy and powerful in miracles, could he in any way be preferred to the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, to whom the Lord says: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven*"?

St. Matthew, xvi. 18, 19.

'When Wilfrid thus ended speaking, the king said: "Colman, were these words really spoken by the Lord to that Peter?" Who answered: "Truly so, O king." But the king said: "Have you anything to show of so great power given to your Columba?" But he answered: "Nothing." Then again the king: "Do both of you," he says, "agree in this without any question, that these things were principally said to Peter, and that to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given by the Lord?" They answered: "Even so, certainly." But he thus concluded: "And I say to you, that this is that door-keeper whom I will not contradict; but so far as I know and am able, I desire to be obedient to all his statutes; lest perchance when I come to the doors of the kingdom of heaven, there may be no one to unlock them, should he who is proved to hold the keys be opposed to me."

'When the king thus spoke, all persons present, whether

seated or standing, great as well as ordinary, applauded; and having renounced the less perfect rule, hastened to conform themselves to those things which they had learned to be better.'

St. Bede says that there was no little discussion also respecting the subject of the tonsure, but it appears to have been settled in the same way as the Easter question. Hist. Eccl. iii. 26.

After the explanation already given regarding the Paschal controversy in Britain, it is not necessary to make any further comment upon the respective arguments of St. Colman and St. Wilfrid. But there are two important points to be noticed in reference to St. Bede's narrative of the Whitby synod in general. See above, pp. 215, 216.

The Synod of Whitby disclosed no interruption of communion.

First:—throughout his whole account of the assembly and its proceedings, there is not the slightest intimation of the existence of any suspension of outward ecclesiastical communion, between the dissentient parties. Had St. Wilfrid regarded the Celts as separated from Roman Catholic communion, he would not have been satisfied by telling St. Colman, that he and his associates sinned if they persisted in their error, after having been made aware that it was contrary to Roman Catholic decrees. He was bold and open in his language, and, if their obstinacy had involved them in separation from Rome and the universal church, he would have told them so distinctly, and would have charged them with the guilt of schism; whereas, though he represents to

them the gravity of their fault, he does not, according to St. Bede, even imply that it involved any interruption of ecclesiastical communion.[1] Again, if outward intercommunion had been suspended, St. Bede would certainly have informed us, not only of the abandonment of the Celtic usages by the majority, but also of their consequent reconciliation to the

[1] Perhaps it should be mentioned, however, that in the short speech which Eddius on this occasion puts into the mouth of St. Wilfrid (*Vita*, cap. x.), he represents him as indirectly anathematizing his opponents in the Paschal controversy. He says that after stating the universal and approved practice, St. Wilfrid declared:—*Hæc ratio disciplinæ Apostolicæ sedis est, et pene totius mundi, et sic dixerunt patres nostri post multa judicia: qui unum ex his condemnaverit, anathema sit.* But, as it has already been shown (see above, pp. 155 &c.), Eddius is not to be entirely relied upon in details, and, in fact, in this same chapter on the Whitby conference, he falls into the strange error of stating that St. Wilfrid was commanded to speak on the occasion by Bishop Agilbert and *Pope* Agatho. He says, *Imperatum est ab Ægelberto Episcopo transmarino, et Agathone Papa, Presbytero Sancto Wilfrido et Abbati suaviloqua eloquentia in sua lingua Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et Apostolicæ sedis dare rationem.* St. Vitalianus was Pope at the time of the Whitby synod, and the pontificate of St. Agatho did not commence till the year 678. St. Bede (as has been said) mentions a *priest* of the name of Agatho as attending on Bishop Agilbert, and Dom. Mabillon suggests that the word *Papa* may perhaps have crept in through the mistake of a transcriber; but the *priest* Agatho would hardly have been spoken of as *commanding* St. Wilfrid, himself a priest and abbot, to address the assembly. It is to be observed that Eddius, though so strongly prejudiced against the Celts, speaks in the same chapter of St. Hilda, who belonged to their party, and was present on their side at Whitby, as 'the holy nun, the most pious Hilda,'—*præsenti Sancta-Moniali piissima Hilda*, &c.

church. Whereas, all that he says is, that, 'having abandoned the less perfect rule, they made haste to adopt those things which they learned to be better (*abdicata minus perfecta institutione, ad ea quæ meliora cognoverunt, sese transferre festinabant*).' If they had been separated from ecclesiastical communion, a formal reconciliation would have been essential.

The Celts acknowledged St. Peter's authority.

Secondly:—it is to be observed that St. Colman's open and explicit profession of faith in the prerogatives divinely conferred upon St. Peter, renders manifest the agreement of the Celtic party with their opponents, on that most essential point.

St. Colman leaves Lindisfarne. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 26. iv. 4.

Nevertheless, St. Colman was not persuaded that he sinned against that authority by persevering, even still, in his Celtic Easter, after the custom of his forefathers; who, as he considered, had always been faithful to the authority of St. Peter's See, as well as to the other precepts of Christianity. He went back to Iona to consult with his own people, and took with him the few other dissentients who would not comply with the decision of the Whitby Synod. He carried away with him part of the bones of St. Aidan, leaving part in St. Aidan's own church of Lindisfarne.

He founds monasteries in Ireland. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 4.

St. Colman was accompanied by all the Scots whom he had collected together at Lindisfarne, and by about thirty English. He subsequently crossed over to Ireland, and established a monastery in the island of Inishboffin, off the western coast. Contentions,

however, having arisen between the English and Irish monks, he removed the former to the mainland of Ireland, founding for them a monastery called Mageo, now Mayo. St. Bede adds that this English house, called, it is said, *Magio na Sasson*, or the 'Saxon Mayo,' had in his time considerably increased, and that it then contained an illustrious family of monks collected together from the English provinces, who had all of them recently been brought to the better ecclesiastical customs, and who, 'after the example of the venerable fathers, lived under a rule and a canonical Abbot, in great continency and purity, by the work of their own hands.'

Sharp's British Gazeteer, vol. ii. p. 204.

Commemoration of St. Colman.

St. Colman has a place amongst the Bollandist Lives of the Saints, on the 18th of February; and the Annals of Four Masters record his coming to Inishboffin, which they assign to the year 667, as follows:—'St. Colman, bishop, with other saints, came to the island of Inisbofin, and there built a monastery which is named after him.'

Moran's Essays on the early Irish church. p. 115, note †.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 26.

St. Bede warmly extols the frugality and continency, as well as the zeal for saving souls displayed by St. Colman and his predecessors at Lindisfarne, who, he says, were wholly intent on serving God and not the world, on cultivating the heart and not the belly. *Tota enim fecit tunc solicitudo doctoribus illis, Deo serviendi non sæculo; tota cura cordis excolendi, non ventris.*

Tuda, the next bishop of Lindisfarne.

St. Bede informs us that St. Colman was succeeded in the Bishopric of the Northumbrians, by 'the

servant of Christ, Tuda, who had been educated and ordained bishop amongst the Southern Scots,' that is, in the south of Ireland. He adds that, according to the custom of his province, he wore the tonsure in the form of a crown, which was the Roman practice, and observed the Catholic rule as to the Paschal season. St. Bede describes him as 'a good and religious man.' He says that 'he arrived from Scotia' (Ireland) 'whilst Colman still held the bishopric,' and that, 'both by word and work, he diligently taught to all, those things which belong to faith and truth.' Thus it would appear that Tuda had previously laboured under Colman in Northumbria, notwithstanding their differences respecting Easter and the tonsure.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 26.

Eata, the Abbot of Melrose, who is styled by St. Bede, 'most reverend and most meek,' was made Abbot of Lindisfarne over the brethren who preferred to remain when St. Colman departed. Eata had been one of twelve English boys whom St. Aidan had received for Christian education at the commencement of his episcopate. It is said that on this account St. Colman, when on the point of leaving, asked and obtained from King Oswy that the charge of the Abbey of Lindisfarne should be entrusted to the said Eata. 'For the king,' adds St. Bede, 'much loved the same Bishop Colman, on account of his innate prudence.' The deference thus shown to St. Colman's wishes in the appointment of Eata, and the freedom with which he was

Eata, the next abbot of Lindisfarne. In loco citato.

also allowed to carry away a portion of St. Aidan's relics, are further indications that he was not even then regarded as a schismatic, although he refused to comply with the decision of the Whitby conference. Eata afterwards became Bishop of Lindisfarne, when that see was restored by Archbishop Theodore, after its temporary suspension on the election of St. Wilfrid to York.

St. Cedd conforms.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 26.

St. Cedd did not imitate the obstinacy of St. Colman. Abandoning the Celtic peculiarities, he conformed to the Catholic customs, and returned to his bishopric amongst the East Saxons.

St. Hilda, Abbess of Whitby.

It has been above mentioned that the celebrated Abbess, St. Hilda, took the part of the Scots in the Whitby conference. St. Bede does not say expressly whether she subsequently persevered in their erroneous customs, or conformed to the general usages, as, from the nature of the case, would appear to be most probable. But he tells us that, 'after having wrought many heavenly works upon earth, being removed hence, she passed to the reception of the rewards of heavenly life,' in the year of our Lord 680, at the age of 66. He speaks of her singular piety and grace, and how she not only afforded an example of life in her own monastery, but by the good report of 'her industry and virtue, furnished occasion of salvation and correction to very many at a distance.' God sent her a lingering illness of many years, during which she was constant in thanksgiving, and in private and public instruction of those com-

Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.

mitted to her charge; whilst her example afforded admonition to all to serve God cheerfully whilst in health, and always faithfully to give thanks to Him under adversity or sickness. In the seventh year of her sickness, her last moment arrived. About cockcrow she received the viaticum, and having sent for her nuns, she admonished them to practise mutual services of love, and to preserve evangelical peace with all. 'Whilst exhorting them,' says St. Bede, 'she gladly saw death approach, nay, rather, to speak in the words of the Lord, she passed from death to life.' Two nuns, one of them in a monastery about thirteen miles distant, the other in a remote part of her own, not being present at the moment of her death, were made witnesses, says the same venerable historian, of 'her entrance into the eternal life of souls;' each of them having seen in a vision, the soul of St. Hilda borne to heaven in brilliant light, amidst a company of holy angels, in the same night that their sisters who were with her, witnessed her departure from this lower world.

St. Bede's account of her life. Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.

St. Hilda affords another instance of the existence of visible intercommunion between the Roman and the Scottish missions. St. Bede informs us that she was descended from the family of King Edwin of Northumbria, 'with which king, at the preaching of Paulinus the first bishop of the Northumbrians, she also received the faith and sacraments of Christ, and preserved them undefiled until she merited to behold Him.' He says that her life of 66 years was divided

into equal portions; that she passed the first thirty-three years 'most nobly in the secular habit,' and that she consecrated the remaining thirty-three 'more nobly to the Lord in the monastic life.' After she had determined to serve Him alone, and had renounced the secular habit, at the age of thirty-three, she withdrew into the province of the East Angles, to whose king she was related, desiring, if possible, to leave her own country and all that she possessed, and to serve God in a strange land in the monastery of Cale, in Gaul, where her sister Heresuid was then 'awaiting her eternal crown.' She remained a year amongst the East Angles with that intention, after which, having been recalled to her own land by Bishop Aidan (*ab Ædano episcopo in patriam revocata*), she received the site of a small convent on the north bank of the river Wire, where she remained for another year. She was then made Abbess of Heruteu, now Hartlepool; and, to use the words of St. Bede:—

Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.

'When Christ's handmaid, Hilda, was preferred to the rule of that monastery, she immediately applied herself to order it in all things after the regular life, according to the instructions she was able to obtain from learned men; for both Bishop Aidan, and as many religious men as were acquainted with her, were accustomed sedulously to visit her, earnestly to love her, and diligently to instruct her, on account of her peculiar wisdom and love of God's service.

'When, therefore, she had presided for some years over this monastery, very intent on establishing the regular life,

it came to pass that she likewise received the charge of constructing or regulating a monastery in a place which is called Streaneshalch' (Whitby), 'and she diligently fulfilled the work which was enjoined her. For she placed this monastery also under the same discipline of regular life as the former; and, indeed, she taught therein the strict observance of justice, piety, and chastity, and the other virtues, but chiefly of peace and charity; so that, after the example of the primitive church, no one there was rich, no one was in want, for all things were common to all, and nothing that anyone possessed seemed to be his own. But her prudence was so great that not only ordinary persons in their difficulties, but sometimes kings and princes, sought counsel from her and received it. She made those under her to give so much attention to the study of the Holy Scriptures and to the practice of good works, that there would most easily be seen there very many who might be found fit to receive ecclesiastical rank, that is, the office of the altar.

'In short, we afterwards saw five bishops out of the same monastery, and all of them men of singular merit and holiness. Their names were Bosa, Aetla, Oftfor, John, and Wilfrid.'[1]

St. Bede's recognition of the Scottish communion.

Such is the account given by St. Bede of St. Hilda. The manner in which he speaks of her and the praises which he accords to her, tend to show that he did not actually consider the Celtic differences in discipline, to have been of that great importance which his language elsewhere might occasionally

[1] This does not seem to be the same person with St. Wilfrid, but Wilfrid II., one of his successors in the see of York. The bishop named before him is St. John of Beverley. St. Hilda ruled a double monastery at Whitby, containing distinct establishments of monks and nuns.

appear to imply. The details which he gives of her history afford unquestionable evidence, that he recognised the religious communion of St. Aidan and the Scottish missionaries, as one with that of the Roman and universal church. He describes them as the fathers of St. Hilda's monastic life.

St. Bede states that St. Hilda died in the year 680, at the age of 66; and that she had been baptized with King Edwin, which event he elsewhere states to have occurred in the year 627. King Edwin fell in battle A.D. 633, and the Scotch missionaries were sent to preach to the English in the year 635, which was the first of St. Oswald's reign. Consequently St. Hilda was born in the year 614, was baptized at the age of thirteen, and had reached the age of twenty-one, having been eight years a Christian, at the time of the arrival of the Scottish missionaries in Northumbria. But her religious connection with those missionaries very probably did not commence until after King Oswin's accession to the throne of Deira, which took place upon the death of St. Oswald, A.D. 642, at the same time that St. Oswald's brother Oswy attained the throne of Bernicia. St. Hilda was at that time twenty-eight years of age. She was related to King Oswin, being the daughter of King Edwin's nephew Hereric. Oswin was son to King Edwin's cousin Osric, who had been originally baptized by St. Paulinus, but had apostatised, after obtaining the crown of Deira, and had soon after been slain whilst fighting against Cadwalla, as already men-

Hist. Eccl. ii. 14.

Ibid. iii. 1, 3.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.

Ibid. iii. 14.

tioned. King Oswin, unlike his unhappy father, was distinguished for his piety and religion, and amongst other virtues and special gifts of grace, St. Bede particularly mentions his humility. He was beloved by all men, and particularly by St. Aidan. It was during his reign (A.D. 647), when St. Hilda had attained the age of thirty-three, that, leaving the world, she retired into East Anglia. It may therefore be reasonably conjectured, as has been said, that she first became acquainted with St. Aidan and the Scottish missionaries at her kinsman Oswin's court, after his accession to the throne of Deira. But, at whatever period her religious connection with them commenced, it was at St. Aidan's call (*ab Ædano episcopo in patriam revocata*) that, in the year 648, she fixed upon Northumbria as the home of her monastic life. It has been seen how closely she was united in religious intimacy with that holy Scottish bishop and his clergy, and how at the conference of Whitby, long after his decease, she took her place upon the Scottish side. Thus, at least, up to the period of that synod (A.D. 664), all through the preceding seventeen years of her monastic life, this neophyte of the Roman St. Paulinus, lived in the closest religious communion with St. Aidan and his successors, and the whole of the Scottish party.

Now the Roman Catholic St. Bede is not only, as has been seen, eloquent and unreserved in his praises of this holy Abbess, during these her seventeen years of closest possible participation of religious com- Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.

munion with the Scottish clergy, but, further, he expressly declares that, after having received from St. Paulinus the faith and sacraments of Christ, she preserved them inviolate till she attained to His blessed vision. It is impossible that St. Bede could have said this if he had considered that St. Aidan and the Scots, with whom St. Hilda was religiously identified, were outwardly separated from the communion of Rome and the church in general. In such case he would have regarded her religious communication with them as involving her in the guilt of schism, and as a foul stain on that baptismal robe which she received through the ministry of the Roman missionary, St. Paulinus, and which he asserts that she preserved undefiled throughout her life. The words of St. Bede are too explicit to be misinterpreted. I extract the whole passage from the original text. It forms the opening of the long chapter devoted to the history of St. Hilda and her virtues, from which I have so largely quoted :—

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 23. ad princip.

'Anno post hunc sequente, hoc est, anno Dominicæ Incarnationis sexcentesimo octogesimo, religiosissima Christi famula Hilda, abbatissa monasterii quod dicitur Streaneshalch, ut supra retulimus, post multa quæ fecit in terris opera cælestia, ad percipienda præmia vitæ cælestis de terris ablata transivit die quintadecima Kalendarum Decembrium, cum esset annorum sexaginta sex : quibus æqua portione divisis, triginta tres primos in sæculari habitu nobilissime conversata complevit, et totidem sequentes nobilius in monachica vita Domino consecravit. Nam et nobilis natu erat, hoc est, filia nepotis Æduini

regis, vocabulo Hererici: cum quo etiam rege, ad prædicationem beatæ memoriæ Paulini, primi Nordanhymbrorum episcopi, fidem et sacramenta Christi suscepit, atque hæc usquedum ad ejus visionem pervenire meruit, intemerata servavit.'

St. Wilfrid and Lindisfarne. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 19.

St. Wilfrid himself commenced his monastic life amongst the Celts, at Lindisfarne, having joined that family of monks with his father's consent at the age of fourteen, in the year 648, whilst they were under the rule of St. Aidan. He was beloved by all, on account of his humility and obedience and other virtues. But St. Bede adds that, after having served God for some years in that monastery, he began to perceive the imperfections of the Scottish rule, and proposed in his mind to go to Rome, to learn the ecclesiastical and monastic usages which were practised at the Apostolic See. When he disclosed his ideas to the Celtic community, so far from objecting or endeavouring to dissuade him from his proposal, as it is evident they would have done if they had been outwardly separated from the communion of the Roman church, they applauded the project and persuaded him to accomplish what was in his mind. St. Bede says:—*Quod cum fratribus referret laudaverunt ejus propositum, eumque id quod mente disposuerat, perficere suadebant.*

St. Cuthbert. See above, p. 6.

The allusion which Dr. Forbes makes to St. Cuthbert in connection with St. Aidan of Lindisfarne, renders necessary a short notice of his history;

St. Cuthbert's practice varied in early and later life.

although it is not easy to discern to which of the two sides Dr. Forbes intends that he should be considered to appertain, on the present occasion.

Vita S. Cuthberti Episc. Lindisf. in Op. S. Bedæ, vel in Bolland. Act. SS. 20 Mart.

It is uncertain whether St. Cuthbert belonged by birth to the Saxon or to the Celtic race, but his early religious life was chiefly passed in the Scottish monastery of Melrose, and at that time he was undoubtedly a follower of the Celtic usages. It is equally certain that in his later days, from the time of the conclusion of the synod of Whitby, he wholly conformed to the Roman practice, and was identified with St. Theodore and the English Church.

Circumstances of his vocation.

St. Bede gives a circumstantial account of St. Cuthbert's early vocation to religion, which was by means of a heavenly vision, as stated in the Roman Martyrology, in a passage already quoted.

See above, p. 277.

Vita, Ubi supra.

Young Cuthbert, it is related, was watching over flocks by night upon the mountains, wakeful and engaged in prayer as was his wont, whilst his companions slept. Suddenly the midnight darkness was dispelled by a flood of light poured forth from heaven, in which he saw a host of angels, who came down to earth, and without delay bore back to their home above, a soul of exceeding brightness. This glorious vision inspired the youth with desires for a life of spiritual discipline, that so he might attain to everlasting bliss amidst the wonderful saints of God. Immediately he rendered thanks and praise to God,

and, arousing his companions, he called on them to do the like.

'"Alas," he exclaimed, "unhappy we, who, given up to sleep and idleness, deserve not to perceive the light of the always watchful ministers of Christ. Lo! I myself, whilst I watched and prayed for a short portion of the night, saw such great wonders of God. The gate of heaven was opened, and there was brought in thither by an angelic company the spirit of some saint, who, now in endless blessedness, beholds the glory of the supernal mansion and Christ its king, whilst we are dwelling in lower darkness. And, indeed, I think it must have been either some holy bishop, or eminent man from amongst the number of the faithful, whom I saw borne up to heaven amidst such brilliant light by so many choirs of guiding angels." Thus speaking, Cuthbert, the man of God, greatly kindled the hearts of the shepherds to revere and praise the Lord; and when morning came he learned that Aidan, bishop of the church of Lindisfarne, a man truly of great virtue, snatched from the body at the moment of his vision, had passed to the heavenly realms; and straightway committing the sheep which he was feeding to their masters, he determined to seek a monastery.' In loc. citat.

He enters the monastery of Melrose.

Moved by the great reputation of Boisil, then prior of Melrose, he betook himself to that abbey, where he was affectionately received, and after a short time numbered amongst the brethren.

The year of St. Cuthbert's birth has not been recorded, but it may be gathered from the above narrative that his entrance into religion, whilst still a youth, occurred in the year 651, since that year was the date of St. Aidan's death.

S. Beda, Vita S. Cuthberti.

After some years' residence at Melrose, St. Cuthbert was selected by Eata, the Abbot, as one of the monks to accompany him to the new monastery for which he had received a locality at Ripon, from King Alfrid of Deira. To St. Cuthbert was assigned the office of guest-master in this newly founded establishment, and St. Bede relates at considerable length, how on one occasion he entertained an angel unawares, and was afterwards frequently favoured with the sight and conversation of angels. But Eata, with St. Cuthbert and the Scottish monks, were afterwards compelled to abandon the monastery at Ripon, and they returned to their former abbey of Melrose. No reason is given for this by St. Bede in his Life of St. Cuthbert, but he states in his Ecclesiastical History, that it was on account of the refusal of Abbot Eata and his monks, to abandon their Celtic usages. In a passage which has been already referred to, St. Bede mentions that King Alfrid was instructed in the Christian religion by St. Wilfrid, after that saint's return from Rome and Gaul, and that the said king rightly preferred St. Wilfrid's teaching to all the traditions of the Scots. 'On this account,' proceeds St. Bede, 'he had also given him a monastery of forty families in a place which is called Ripon, which place indeed he had shortly before given to be held as a monastery to those who followed the Scots. But because when the choice was afterwards given them, they preferred to give up the place rather than change

Lib. iii. c. 25.

See above, p. 283.

their custom, he bestowed it on him who was worthy of it, both in doctrine and in life,' that is, upon St. Wilfrid.

This was previous to the great Whitby conference, whose decision in favour of the Roman practice appears to have been accepted both by St. Cuthbert and by Eata. For, as has been already mentioned, when St. Colman left the country immediately after the aforesaid conference, Eata was, at his request, appointed Abbot of Lindisfarne in his stead; and St. Cuthbert was afterwards appointed by Eata to be Prior of the same house. Eata was subsequently made Bishop of Lindisfarne. It is, therefore, evident that neither Eata nor St. Cuthbert can have persisted with Colman in adhering to the Celtic customs.

St. Bede makes particular mention of the persevering patience and gentleness, with which the holy Cuthbert strove to bring over to the stricter rule certain brethren at Lindisfarne, who still clung to their former mode of life;[1] and he says that, under

Vita S. Cuthberti, cap. v. n. 25. in Bolland. Act. SS. 20 Mart.

[1] M. de Montalembert (Moines d'Occident, t. iv. p. 402) understands this as partly having reference to the Celtic customs, whose maintainers he says did not all of them depart with St. Colman. Though reluctant to differ from so distinguished an author, I cannot find anything in the original text of St. Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert, which implies more than that certain of the Lindisfarne monks were slow to act up to the monastic rule; and in his Ecclesiastical History (lib. iii. c. 26) St. Bede distinctly states that St. Colman took away with him such as 'were willing to follow him, *that is*, those who would not accept the Catholic Easter, and the tonsure in the shape of a crown.' *Adsumptis his qui se sequi voluerunt (id est, qui Pascha catholicum, et tonsuram*

all trials and difficulties, the cheerfulness of his countenance was an evident indication of the internal consolation which he experienced from the Holy Ghost.

He retires into solitude.

After several years passed in the monastery of Lindisfarne, St. Cuthbert, with the consent of the Abbot and brethren, retired to a solitary abode near at hand; and ultimately to the neighbouring island of Farne, a place at all times surrounded by the sea and not accessible from the mainland at low water, as was the case with Holy Island on which the monastery was built. The same island of Farne had also been made use of by St. Aidan as a place of occasional religious retirement.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iii. 16.

Is consecrated bishop.

Simeon of Durham, quoted by Mgr., now Archbp., Eyre in his Hist. of St. Cuthbert, 2nd ed. London, 1858, pp. 50, 51.

Anglo-Saxon Chron. A.D. 685.

Here, for eight years or more, St. Cuthbert served his God as an anchorite, till he was elected to the bishopric of Hexham in a large synod held at Twyford, near the river Alne, in the year 684, at which St. Theodore, the archbishop, presided. It was not till the following spring that he was consecrated at York, by St. Theodore, on Easter Sunday. Seven bishops, amongst whom St. Theodore held the primacy, were there assembled for the purpose. Although St. Cuthbert was elected to Hexham, it was arranged that Bishop Eata should occupy that see, and leave his own see of Lindisfarne to Cuthbert.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 28.

See above, pp. 178, 179.

The before-mentioned synod of Hertford, which insisted on the universal observance of the Roman

coronæ, nam et de hoc quæstio non minima erat, recipere nolebant), in Scottiam regressus est, &c. &c.

Easter, had been held only twelve years previously, A.D. 673; and it is plain that St. Theodore, who had presided at that synod, would not have consecrated any one as bishop who still adhered to the Celtic customs.

He dies at Farne.

Zealous, patient, loving, cheerful, affable and diligent, the holy Cuthbert fulfilled all the duties of a bishop, without abandoning the strictness of the monastic life. But before three years had elapsed from the period of his consecration, he felt aware that the time of his departure for a better country was drawing near, and divesting himself of his episcopal duties, he returned to his beloved retirement in the isle of Farne, so soon as the festival day of Christmas had been kept, in the year 686. Here he again lived as an anchorite till the 20th of the ensuing March, on which day his blessed soul took its flight to the heavenly realms of bliss.

S. Beda, Vita S. Cuthberti, cap. x. in Bolland. Act. SS. 20 Mart.

Simultaneous death of St. Herbert and St. Cuthbert. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. iv. 29.

On an island in the midst of the lake of Derwentwater, in Cumberland, there dwelt a holy priest and hermit who bore the name of Herbert. He was united to St. Cuthbert by the sacred tie of closest spiritual friendship, and he was wont to visit him every year, and to receive from him advice on matters concerning his everlasting welfare. When last these two men of God had met and mutually conversed upon the things of heaven, St. Cuthbert bade his friend to be careful then to ask him all the questions he desired, and to exhaust all he wished to say, for never in the flesh would they see each other more. 'For I am sure,'

he added, 'that the time of my dissolution is at hand, and speedily shall I put off this tabernacle of the body.' On hearing this, St. Herbert threw himself at St. Cuthbert's feet, and with tears and sighs he earnestly entreated him to obtain of the Lord, that together they might pass to the vision of Him in heaven, Whom together they had served on earth. St. Cuthbert knelt and prayed, and when he had ended he bade his friend rejoice, because God's goodness had granted his request. A tedious sickness fell on Herbert, and it may be supposed, says St. Bede, that this happened by the Divine mercy, so that if he was in anything inferior in merit to the blessed Cuthbert, the chastising pain of the long illness might supply it, and that thus being made equal in grace with Cuthbert, not only might they together put off the body, but also be received together into one and the same seat of never-ending joy. On the self-same day, says St. Bede, the 20th of March, A.D. 687, 'their souls going forth from the body were quickly united in the happy vision of each other, and alike translated to the heavenly kingdom by the ministry of angels.'

On the same day, the 20th of March, St. Cuthbert is still commemorated in the Roman martyrology, as follows:—

'In Britain, the decease of St. Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne, who from his boyhood even till his death was resplendent with holy works and the signs of miracles.'

In Britannia depositio sancti Cuthberti Episcopi Lindisfarnensis, qui a pueritia ad obitum usque sanctis operibus et miraculorum signis effulsit.

St. Cuthbert's dying words. Vit. apud Bolland. Act. SS. 20 Mart. cap. xi. n. 60.

St. Bede relates, that when St. Cuthbert was drawing near to death, Herefrid, then Abbot of Lindisfarne, asked of him to leave some farewell words for the brethren, and that the dying Saint in reply exhorted them briefly, but strongly, to peace, humility, charity, and unanimity; to the love of God and of their neighbour, and to the exercise of friendly and kind hospitality towards any of the household of the faith who sought it from them; not esteeming themselves better than others whose faith and whose life were like their own. 'But,' he proceeded, 'let there be no communion between yourselves and those who go astray from the unity of Catholic peace, whether through not celebrating the Pasch at its proper season, or through an evil mode of life. And be it known and remembered by you that, if necessity shall compel you to choose one of two evils, I very much prefer that, taking my bones up from the grave and carrying them away with you, you should retire from these places and remain as sojourners wherever God may provide, rather than that, on any account consenting to iniquity, you should submit your necks to the yoke of schismatics.' [1]

[1] The original text is as follows:—'Cum illis autem qui ab unitate Catholicæ pacis, vel Pascha non suo tempore celebrando, vel perverse vivendo, aberrant, vobis sit nulla communio. Sciatisque et memoria retineatis, quod si vos unum e duobus adversis

Explanation of St. Cuthbert's language.

It is evident that this very strong language of reprobation (excepting so far as it applied to men of evil lives) must have been directed against the followers of the Celtic usages; for the circumstances previously related show plainly, that, for some time before his death, St. Cuthbert had abandoned the Scottish peculiarities, and had accepted the Roman and universal customs.

On the other hand, it cannot be supposed that St. Cuthbert, in his last moments upon earth, intended this solemn warning to his brethren as any repudiation of the communion of his venerated predecessor St. Aidan, by the vision of whose blessed soul borne by angels into heaven, he had himself been brought to follow the monastic rule. Nor can it be thought that he meant to condemn as schismatic his own early religious life, resplendent, says the Roman martyrology, even from boyhood, with good works, although in those days of youth he preferred, with his friend and spiritual father Eata, to abandon their newly-founded monastery at Ripon, rather than give up the same Celtic practices the maintainers of which he so earnestly rejected at his death.

The words of the dying Saint must be understood of the time and the place in which they were spoken.

eligere necessitas coegerit, multò plus diligo, ut eruentes de tumulo tollentesque vobiscum ossa mea, recedatis ab his locis, et ubicumque Deus providerit incolæ maneatis, quam ut ulla ratione consentientes iniquitati, schismaticorum jugo colla subdatis.'—*S. Beda, Vita S. Cuthberti.*

They do not apply to the earlier period, when the Celtic divergences from the Roman Catholic rule were tolerated in the English Church; nor yet to those regions over which no control was exercised by English ecclesiastical authority.

Stricter rule in England.

There can be no question that, so far as regards the English Church, the position of the followers of the Celtic usages was materially altered by the Synods of Whitby and Hertford. In fact, the latter (A.D. 673) bound the English clergy, as has been seen, to the observance of the Roman Easter, under pain of suspension from sacerdotal functions and local excommunication. But the authority of these synods did not extend beyond the limits of the English Church, and neither Britons, Picts nor Scots paid any regard to their decrees. Nearly thirty years had elapsed from the time of the death of St. Cuthbert, before the monks of Iona could be prevailed upon to abandon their ancient customs, and to conform to the Catholic rules on the disputed points of discipline. The Picts were only a few years earlier in their acceptance of the same Roman usages, as will shortly be related.

See above, p. 179.

St. Adamnan, Abbot of Iona. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 15. Lanigan, Hist. Eccl. Ireland, vol. iii. pp. 96, &c. Butler, Sept. 23.

In the year 686, which was the year preceding St. Cuthbert's decease, St. Adamnan, Abbot of Iona, was entrusted by his Irish fellow-countrymen with a mission to King Alfrid,[1] then reigning over North-

[1] This was a different person from King Alfrid of Deira, before mentioned as the friend of St. Wilfrid.

umbria. Its object was to obtain the redemption of certain captives, who had been carried off from Ireland by the army of Alfrid's brother and predecessor, King Egfrid. St. Adamnan remained some time in Northumbria, and whilst there he became acquainted with the canonical customs of the Church, and, listening to the counsels which were given to him, he abandoned the Celtic peculiarities and conformed to the general practice. 'For,' adds St. Bede, 'he was a good man and wise, and most excellently instructed in the knowledge of the Scriptures.'

Hist. Eccl. v. 15.

On his return to Iona, St. Adamnan endeavoured to bring his own monks, and all the religious houses subject to his monastery, to the same conviction and practice, but wholly without success. It was apparently after this, that 'he sailed,' St. Bede adds, 'to Ireland, and preaching to them and with modest exhortation declaring the legitimate time of Easter, he brought back very many of them, and almost all who were not under the dominion of the monastery of Iona, to Catholic unity,[1] cured of their ancestral error (*ab errore avito correctos*), and taught them to observe the proper time of Easter.'

[1] *Ad unitatem reduxit catholicam.* This expression must not be understood in its literal and absolute meaning, but, like others of a similar nature, it must be interpreted according to the general purport of the whole of St. Bede's history, which affords no ground for the supposition that he regarded the persons here mentioned, as having been actually separated from Catholic unity, but only as having deviated from it to the extent of the peculiar observances in question.

After celebrating the canonical Easter in Ireland, he returned to his own monastery of Iona, where he earnestly but fruitlessly strove to induce that community to conform to the general practice. Before the next Easter came round, it pleased God, says St. Bede, to remove him to eternal life, so 'that this man, so earnest in his pursuit of peace and unity, might not be compelled by the return of the Paschal season, to enter into more serious disagreement with those who would not learn from him the truth.'

Thus, in spite of their obstinacy, St. Adamnan did not sever his spiritual connection with these monks; yet he would have been obliged to have done so if they had been cut off from the communion of Rome and the universal Church, to whose practices he had himself conformed, and to whose communion he unquestionably belonged.

St. Adamnan died in the year 704, having been Abbot of Iona since A.D. 679. He was the author of several works, and amongst them of a well-known life of St. Columba, with whom he was connected by lineage, as were almost all the abbots of Iona for more than two centuries from its foundation. Though in his lifetime he was unable to persuade his monks to conform to the Catholic discipline, yet when he died, 'he left among them,' says Butler, 'a judicious treatise, on the right time of keeping Easter, which disposed them some time after to forsake their erroneous computation.'

Lanigan, Hist. Eccl. Ireland, vol. iii. p. 99, n. 57.

It is possible that the teaching of St. Adamnan

The Picts.

The Picts conform to the Roman usages. A.D. 710. Hist. Eccl. v. 21.

exercised an influence upon the neighbouring Picts; for in the year 710 the Pictish King Naitan, 'admonished,' says St. Bede, 'by frequent meditation on ecclesiastical writings, renounced the error in which up to that time he was held, together with his nation, as regards the observance of Easter, and brought himself and all his people to celebrate the Catholic season of the Lord's Resurrection.'

In order the better to accomplish this object, King Naitan sent messengers to Abbot Ceolfrid of Jarrow, requesting from him letters of advice, respecting the proper season for keeping Easter, and the proper form of the clerical tonsure. He also asked for architects to build for his people a church after the Roman fashion, and he promised that it should be dedicated in honour of the blessed Prince of the Apostles; adding, that 'he and all his people would always follow the custom of the holy Roman and Apostolic Church, as far as they were able to learn it at so great a distance from the Roman language and nation.' Abbot Ceolfrid in reply sent him the architects he desired, and addressed to him a lengthy epistle.

Letter of Abbot Ceolfrid to King Naitan. Hist. Eccl. v. 21. Respecting Easter.

St. Bede gives the letter in full, and it is probable that he assisted St. Ceolfrid in its composition, being himself an inmate of the monastery at Jarrow. Its writer explains at great length, both the time appointed under the Jewish law for the observance of the Mosaic Pasch, and the manner in which the proper season is to be ascertained for the celebration of the corresponding Christian festival of Easter.

Respecting the tonsure.

As regards the tonsure he acknowledges that more than one shape had been used in the Catholic Church, and confesses that it might be said 'that a difference in the form of the tonsure is not hurtful to those whose faith towards God is pure, and whose charity towards their neighbour is sincere; especially since it is not found in the Catholic fathers, that there was any controversy respecting a difference in the tonsure, as there was contention respecting a diversity as to Easter, or the faith.' Nevertheless he holds that there is no form of tonsure to be preferred to that of St. Peter, and 'none to be held in greater detestation and abomination by all the faithful than that' of Simon Magus. The popular mistake in assigning these origins for the two forms of tonsure respectively, has already been commented upon. Besides claiming St. Peter as the author of the practice which he advocates, the writer urges that the perfect circle of the Roman tonsure represents our Lord's passion, in its resemblance to His crown of thorns; and sets forth the mortification of the flesh to be exercised by those who wear it, as well as their hope of being crowned hereafter with Christ in His glory; whereas the imperfect tonsure of the Celts, with its deceptive appearance of a crown, is fit only for Simoniacs, who, in the eyes of fallible men, may seem worthy of eternal life, but who in the next world will not only be frustrated of all hope of a crown, but condemned to eternal punishment.

See above, pp. 211, &c.

'Do not think, however,' proceeds the writer, 'that

I have said these things as if I regarded those who wear this' (Celtic) 'tonsure as condemned, if in faith and works they favour Catholic unity; on the contrary, I confidently avow that very many of them have been holy and worthy of God, amongst whom is Adamnan, the illustrious abbot and priest of the Columbians' (*Columbiensium*—meaning the monks of Iona), 'who, when sent as an ambassador from his nation to King Alfrid, wished also to see our monastery, and displayed wonderful prudence, humility, and religion, both in his manner and his words.'

He says that, having asked of St. Adamnan his reason for wearing the tonsure of Simon Magus instead of that of St. Peter, Adamnan assured him in reply, that though he did wear Simon's tonsure after the custom of his country, yet with his whole heart he detested and rejected Simoniacal wickedness, and, as far as he was able, wished to follow in the footsteps of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles. To which Ceolfrid answered that he believed him, but that it would be much more fitting if he would shape his outward tonsure according to his inward sentiments.

In describing this conversation, Ceolfrid represents himself as addressing Adamnan as 'holy brother'—*sancte frater*, and speaks of Adamnan as styling him in return, 'my beloved brother'—*frater mi dilecte*; terms which certainly do not convey the idea of any suspension of ecclesiastical communion.

St. Ceolfrid then remarks that Adamnan showed how much he had profited by beholding the statutes of the English churches, since after his return to Scotia (Ireland), he brought large multitudes by his preaching to the observance of Easter at the Catholic season, though he could not succeed in convincing his own monks of Iona; and that he would have been mindful to amend the tonsure also, if his authority had so far prevailed.

St. Ceolfrid finally exhorted King Naitan to strive in all respects, together with his people, to observe those things which were agreeable to catholic unity and the Apostolic Church. 'Thus,' concludes the letter, 'after having received the power of a temporal kingdom, may the same most blessed Prince of the Apostles freely set open to thee and to thine, with the rest of the elect, the entrance of the heavenly kingdom also. May the grace of the Eternal King preserve thee long reigning in safety for the peace of us all, most beloved son in Christ.'

King Naitan's reception of the exhortation. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 21

This letter was read in public before King Naitan and many learned men, and carefully interpreted into the King's own language. It is said that when he heard it, he greatly rejoiced at the exhortation. Rising up from amongst his nobles, he knelt down upon the ground, and gave God thanks for this gift from the land of the English. He said that he had indeed been previously aware that such was the true time for the celebration of Easter, but that the reason of it was now made so plain to him, that he seemed to

have understood it very imperfectly before. Therefore, he publicly declared and protested that he and his people would always observe that time of Easter, and he decreed that his clergy should also receive the Roman tonsure. The Catholic mode of computing Easter and of shaping the clerical tonsure, was forthwith universally proclaimed and received throughout his dominion;[1] and, says St. Bede, 'the nation being corrected, rejoiced that it was placed under, as it were, the new direction of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, Peter, and was to be guarded by his patronage.'

[1] There exists an ancient record of the expulsion of the family of Ia across the dorsal chain of mountains by King Nectan (Naitan) A.D. 717, which has given rise to the erroneous supposition that the monks of Iona were banished from their monastery by that King, in consequence of their refusal to comply with the Roman usages after the adoption of them by King Naitan and his people. Now, the island of Iona was not under the Pictish King's jurisdiction, so that the said record could not in any case refer to the Monastery of Iona in itself, but only to certain monks belonging to it who were residing in the Pictish territory. But besides this, the date assigned, as above said, for their banishment, is subsequent to that of the reception of the Roman customs by the Monastery of Iona; whose inmates, as we are told by St. Bede (B. v. c. 22), conformed to the Catholic practices, A.D. 716, and he adds that Egbert, who persuaded them so to conform, remained with them thirteen years afterwards, till the time of his death, nor does St. Bede allude to their tranquillity having been in any way disturbed. The record in question appears to refer to the expulsion of certain monks belonging to Iona, but resident in King Naitan's dominions, whom he sent away, not on account of any religious difference, but because they had, it is said, excited discontent amongst his subjects.—See Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. Ireland, vol. iii. p. 157, &c.

Nec mora, quæ dixerat regia auctoritate perfecit. Statim namque jussu publico mittebantur ad transcribendum, discendum, observandum, per universas Pictorum provincias circuli Paschæ decennovenales, obliteratis per omnia erroneis octoginta et quatuor annorum circulis. Adtondebantur omnes in coronam ministri altaris ac monachi; et quasi novo se discipulatui beatissimi apostolorum principis Petri subditam, ejusque tutandam patrocinio, gens correcta gaudebat.

S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 21.

Iona at length conforms. A.D. 716. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 22, and iii. 4, 27.

The monastery of Iona, or Hii, with its dependencies, now contained the only remaining portion of the Scottish Christians who adhered to the old Celtic peculiarities, and before many years had elapsed, these also were brought to conformity with Rome and the universal church. St. Bede records this happy change as having been accomplished in the year 716, through the exhortations of 'the father and priest Egbert, beloved by God, and to be named with all honour.'

The English priest Egbert.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 27.

Egbert was an Englishman of noble birth, who, many years previously, had gone over to Ireland, as St. Bede tells us was the practice of many, both from amongst the noble and middle class of English, in the days of Bishops Finan and Colman. Their object, he says, was either the prosecution of divine study, or the grace of a stricter life. Some of them accordingly became monks, others assiduously sought knowledge, visiting the abodes of different masters in turn. The Irish most hospitably received

them, and generously provided them with food, as well as with books and instructors, without any charge.

Hist. Eccl. iii. 27.

St. Bede states that Egbert died in the year 729, at the age of ninety, after a life of great piety and perfection, by which he did honour to the sacerdotal office. He must, therefore, have been advanced in years when he came over to Iona from Ireland, A.D. 716, according to the same venerable author. The monks of Iona received Egbert 'honourably and with great joy. And being,' proceeds St. Bede, 'a most agreeable teacher and a most devoted practiser of what he taught, he was willingly heard by all, so that by his pious and diligent exhortations, he removed them from that inveterate tradition of their fathers, to whom may be applied the saying of the Apostle, that "they had a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge;" and he taught them, as we have said, to fulfil the celebration of the principal solemnity in the catholic and apostolic manner, wearing on their heads the form of an uninterrupted crown.'

Ibid. v. 22.

His successful exhortations to the monks of Iona.

Rom. x. 2.

St. Bede adds that this reception of the general usages on the part of the monks of Iona, took place under Abbot Dunchad, about eighty years after St. Aidan had first been sent forth from the same monastery, A.D. 635, to preach the gospel to the Angles of Northumbria; and he calls attention, as previously stated, to the admirable dispensation of Divine Providence, through which the Scotch, who had so freely communicated what they knew of divine truth to the English nation, were in their turn

See above, p. 202.

afterwards brought to the perfect rule by the English, on those points in which they had been deficient. Whereas the Britons, who would not extend to the Saxons that knowledge of the Christian faith which they possessed, still remained obstinate in their errors, at the period when St. Bede concluded his history.

The death of Egbert. S. Bedæ Hist. Eccl. v. 22.

Egbert remained for the rest of his life in the island of Iona. He died, by a remarkable coincidence, on Easter Day itself, in the year 729, when that festival was celebrated on the 24th of April. This was a date on which it could not have fallen according to the old Celtic mode of computation, and consequently it had never before been observed on that day within St. Columba's monastery of Iona, nor in any of the dependent houses. The fact that it was so kept on this occasion, was a manifest proof that the Scottish monks had completely abandoned their ancient practices, which at that time had degenerated into national, and almost sectarian, peculiarities, and that they had fully accepted the Roman reforms, in accordance with their fellow-Christians in general. Rejoicing at this happy result of his endeavours, Egbert passed away to his Lord after the celebration of that Easter Day's mass. St. Bede recounts the circumstance as follows :—

The reform was complete.

Hist. Eccl. v. 22.

'But the man of the Lord, Egbert, remained for thirteen years in the aforesaid island' (of Iona), 'which he had consecrated to Christ as if by a certain new resplendent grace of ecclesiastical fellowship and peace' (*quam ipse, velut nova quadam relucente gratia ecclesiastica*

societatis et pacis, Christo consecraverat); 'and in the year of the Lord's incarnation, seven hundred and twenty-nine, in which the Lord's Pasch was kept on the eighth day of the Kalends of May, after he had celebrated the solemnity of the mass in commemoration of the same resurrection of the Lord, he himself, on the same day, passed to the Lord, and completed with the Lord and the Apostles and the rest of the citizens of heaven, the joy of the chief festival which he had commenced with the brethren whom he had converted to the grace of unity' (*quos ad unitatis gratiam converterat*); 'nay, rather, he never ceases to celebrate the same without end. But it was a wonderful dispensation of the Divine Providence that the venerable man not only passed out of this world to the Father on the Pasch, but also when the Pasch was celebrated on that day on which it had never before been wont to be celebrated in those places. The brethren therefore rejoiced in the certain and catholic knowledge of the Paschal season. They were joyful in the patronage of the father by whom they had been corrected, now departing to the Lord. He on his part rejoiced with them that he had been preserved in the flesh, till the time when he beheld his hearers accepting and keeping, together with himself, that Paschal day which they had always avoided before. And thus certain of their correction, the most reverend father exulted to see the day of the Lord. He saw it, and was glad.'

The true sense of St. Bede's expressions.

The expressions in the above extract which speak of the Scots of Iona as thus 'converted to the grace of unity,' and, 'consecrated to Christ by, as it were, a new grace of ecclesiastical fellowship and peace,' must be interpreted according to the general tenor of the language of St. Bede's history, and in accordance with the conclusion to be drawn from the aggre-

gate testimony of the facts which he has related. If these and similar expressions in his writings are viewed in their proper connection, and are received according to the intention of their author, as it is made manifest from other passages, it will become evident that they cannot justly be understood to imply the existence of any formal interruption of ecclesiastical communion, between the Celtic and other Churches. They can only be construed as alluding to, and indicating, the partial divisions to which the divergences in question gave rise.

If the monks of Iona had literally been severed from 'the grace of unity,' owing to their perseverance in the Celtic peculiarities, it cannot be supposed that the Catholic Egbert, who was held in such high veneration by St. Bede, would have come amongst them as he did, before their reform had been effected. The monks also on their part, as St. Bede informs us, received him 'honourably, and with great joy.' It is therefore evident that, in the proper sense of the words, there was no interruption on either side, of 'ecclesiastical fellowship and peace.'

Hist. Eccl. v. 22.

Further, as it has been already observed, if the Celtic party had been outwardly separated from the communion of Rome and the universal Church, none of its members could, either collectively or individually, have been restored to the fellowship of the faithful, without a formal act of reconciliation, which historians could hardly have failed to mention. But no such formal reconciliation is recorded by St. Bede or by

any other writer, as having taken place or in any way having been required, either in the case of the monks of Iona, or in that of any other persons who, as St. Bede expresses it, were 'converted to the grace of unity.' From this fact alone it might be inferred that the interruption of unity was not complete, and that it did not extend beyond differences on unessential points of discipline; although the Paschal question undoubtedly was of great practical importance.

From all that has been said, it may reasonably be concluded that the differences in question between the Celtic Christians, whether Britons, Scots or Picts, on the one hand; and the Roman and universal Church, on the other; are to be looked upon as amongst the instances afforded by ecclesiastical history, of variations in discipline not actually opposed to faith or charity; and therefore not involving any formal breach of ecclesiastical unity, or formal suspension of ecclesiastical communion, although affording occasion for dissension, and for partial division.

Testimony of the Ven. Peter of Cluny. in Op. S. Bernardi, Ed. Par. 1719, Ep. ccxxix. n. 9. Quoted as Motto opposite to the title page of this volume.

When the Venerable Peter, Abbot of Cluny, wrote to St. Bernard in the twelfth century on the differences between Cluny and Clairvaux, he appealed to the divergence between the Angles and Scots respecting Easter, in Britain, as an instance of ecclesiastical difference without breach of ecclesiastical unity.

The same venerable abbot would have formed a very different judgment of the existing divisions between the Roman Catholic Church, and the present Anglican communion.

After referring to the case of the British Churches, and to the instances of St. Aidan and St. Cuthbert, Dr. Forbes concludes his appeal to history by the remark:—'Subjective unity was suspended during the struggles of the antipopes, yet no one considers the followers of Peter de Luna as either heretics or schismatics.'

The antipopes. See above, extract, vol. i. p. 70.

The position of the antipopes and their followers is too clear and well defined, to render it necessary to speak of the history of that most unhappy schism.

Neither the antipopes nor their followers were heretics; but they were unquestionably schismatics.

The question of heresy does not arise throughout the case. All the separated parties believed in the divinely constituted authority of the Roman See, and in the necessity of visible communion with the universal Church in subjection to it. But the supporters of an antipope recognised a pretender in place of the rightful pontiff. Many who belonged to such a schismatical communion, may no doubt be supposed to have been invincibly ignorant of their error, for it was very difficult under the circumstances to obtain correct information. This ignorance—that is, ignorance not attributable to their own fault—would exculpate such persons from the guilt of formal schism, though it could not rescue them from their external position of material schism, however involuntary on their part. Even saints were misled on that sad occasion, and St. Vincent Ferrer for a considerable time was a follower of Peter de Luna, though he was finally undeceived.

It will not be denied that to set up or to support a rival bishop in opposition to one duly elected to any see, is a flagrant act of schism; and that all persons are guilty of schism who knowingly and wilfully take part or concur in such act. If there should be others who, through want of correct information, believe the pretender to be the rightful bishop, and in good faith and innocence therefore attach themselves to his party, such persons certainly would not be involved in the formal guilt of schism, though outwardly taking part with schismatics.

This was precisely the position of the antipopes and their followers; but the members of the established Church of England are not in the same position. There can be no difficulty at the present time, in discerning the rightful successor of St. Peter, or in recognising the body of the faithful who are in his communion. If, however, the case of the antipopes is appealed to, in evidence that it is possible for individuals who are outwardly in a state of schism, to be excusable from its guilt in the sight of Almighty God on account of their invincible ignorance, no instance could be more apt in illustration of that generally received teaching.

But who are they who, being outwardly separated from the Church in our own time and country, can justly lay claim to the excuse of invincible ignorance? God alone, the great Searcher of the hearts and reins, can tell. So far as man can see, the excuse would apply to those simple pious souls who,

without any means of better instruction or of further knowledge, in a humble or a busy sphere of life, are striving to the best of their power to fulfil their duty to God and to their neighbour, in all charity and sincerity, without a thought or a question that they may possibly be in a position of separation from the one Church of Christ; souls by whom the very refuge of invincible ignorance is unthought of. If men have fears respecting their position, and refuse to seek for further light, they cannot plead that ignorance as invincible which they will not endeavour to overcome.

Conclusion.

It has been my object in these volumes to show, that the true Church of Christ can never be subjected to any outward division within its own pale; and that, amongst the sections into which Christendom is now visibly divided, one only Church can possess Divine authority, be the channel of Divine grace, and instruct mankind with certainty in the Divine revelation and the way of eternal life. One only can be the sheepfold and the abode of the true Shepherd, apart from Whom there is no salvation. Here He dispenses to the faithful the abundant fulness of His saving grace, and here alone has He fixed His ark of refuge, by which fallen man may escape the deluge of abounding sin, and reach in safety the eternal shore of bliss.

The doctrine of an invisible Church implies visible disunion, together with the absence of any sure external marks to denote the true body of the faithful. But if the Church is visible, and if outside that Church

there is no salvation, it becomes evident both from the necessity of the case, and also because God 'will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth,' that the Church must always and constantly possess outward marks and signs, which intrinsically and inseparably belong to her, and by which she may always be known to all. These marks and signs must be visible as herself, and enduring as herself, for 'all days, even to the consummation of the world'; and every theory stands self-condemned, which is based on the assumption that any one of the said marks and signs of God's true Church can ever be suspended, or dispensed with.

1 Tim. ii. 4.

St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

If Unity is one of these divinely-constituted notes, as it is solemnly declared to be in the Church's Creed, it becomes impossible that any two outwardly separated corporate bodies can both of them be portions of the one Church of Christ. If the Roman Catholic Church and the established Church of England belong, each of them, to the Church of Christ, then, for the last three hundred years and more, Christ's Church has lost the note of Unity.

Vol. i. pp. 20, 21, 124–127.

It has been shown that the position of corporate bodies is totally distinct from that of individuals. Individual men exist for private ends. They have, each of them, individual souls to save or lose, and they must therefore be regarded in their inward as well as outward aspect. God alone, Who reads the heart, can tell of any particular individual outwardly separated from His Church, whether such person is

nevertheless inwardly one with her in soul. But corporate bodies exist only for a public end, and are wholly external in their aspect, though they may form the instruments of supernatural agency for evil or for good. The Catholic Church has been formed for the universal good. She is God's visible and appointed instrument for the salvation of mankind. This is the reason and the end of her existence. For this she is animated by God's Spirit, and is constituted the channel of His grace; and adequately to fulfil this end, she can be but one in the sight of all men, and can suffer no division.

Reason tells us this must be so, and faith asserts it, in our creeds.[1]

[1] These observations, together with the whole line of argument pursued in the first two sections of this work, will apply to the views set forth in a recent pamphlet, entitled '"Separation" not "Schism,"' by Mr. Cobb, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, which appeared too late for more detailed notice in my pages. In the above publication, as well as in a subsequent letter to *The Tablet* of 20th November, 1869, Mr. Cobb, amongst other points, lays especial stress on the historical facts connected with the Church of England. Those facts admit of discussion, and opposing conclusions may be deduced from them. But, apart from this consideration, they rest on mere human and uncertain testimony, and cannot be set in opposition to the divine witness of the creed; nor be appealed to in refutation of the conclusion which must be arrived at, from an application of the words of the same creed to the visible divisions of the present day. Mr. Cobb's whole theory is based upon the false assumption of the *possibility*, in the case of corporate bodies, of the existence of outward mutual separation and absence of visible intercommunion, *within* the actual pale of the Catholic Church of Christ. Such an assumption is contradictory to the definition of the Church's notes and attributes, which forms a portion of our creed.

The Church's Unity is a point of faith.

In the earliest Christian Creed the Church is defined as Holy and as Catholic:—*Credo Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam.* But as the ages passed on, and schisms and heresies increased, the Divine wisdom which ever dwells in and directs the Church of Christ, guided her to pronounce a fuller definition and explanation of her notes and attributes. In like manner as she found it necessary to define the consubstantiality of the Son of God with the Eternal Father; and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; so did she feel called upon to define her own Unity and Apostolicity.

The Note of Unity is necessarily comprised in that of Holiness; for the very essence of Holiness is charity; and no body of men can be inwardly ruled and knit together by the Divine grace of charity, without their unity in heart and act being visibly manifest to all. So also, Apostolicity is implied in Catholicity; for it was to the Apostles alone and to their successors, that the mission was entrusted by Jesus Christ:—'Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature.'

St. Mark xvi. 15.

These are the four Notes which are defined in the Nicene Creed, as the inseparable marks of the true Church of Christ, by which she is to be known and recognised throughout all ages. Not one of them can be dispensed with, for they have each and all been handed down, that by the absence of any one may be discerned the 'false Christs,' and the 'false prophets,' who are all around. Every recitation of the Nicene

Creed includes a solemn act of faith in this definition of the Church's Notes. The act would be a mockery if any one of them could even momentarily fail, or become invisible.

First upon that sacred list of tokens, which are visibly to denote to man the one dwelling of the one true Christ, is found the mark of Unity,—Unity, the everlasting attribute of God,—Unity, for which Christ prayed as the perpetual heritage of the one body of His faithful, and the never-ceasing sign of His own mission from the Father:—

'That they all may be one, as Thou Father in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.' St. John xvii. 21.

This Divine prayer ever has been, is, and will be with us, in its power and its fulfilment.

Credo Unam Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

260.21
R35

Rhodes, M. J.

AUTHOR

The Visible Unity of the

TITLE Catholic Churchl